

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 312 904

FL 018 239

AUTHOR Cline, Herman H.
TITLE Is There a Hidden Agenda? The English Language Amendment.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 96p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Acculturation; Bilingual Education; Bilingualism; *Constitutional Law; *Cultural Pluralism; Elections; *English; English (Second Language); Federal Legislation; *Language Attitudes; *Official Languages; Public Opinion; Second Language Instruction; Social Values
IDENTIFIERS *English Language Amendment; United States

ABSTRACT

A discussion of the movement to make English the official language of the United States, by constitutional amendment, looks for a hidden agenda among its advocates. The history of and debate over the amendment in Congress and around the country are reviewed, drawing from legislative texts, speeches, essays, media commentary, and related research. It is argued that groups supporting the amendment try to advance their proposals by appealing to the traditions of the American value system, opposing the "salad bowl" concept of American culture (in which different elements are thrown together but not "melted") in favor of the "melting pot" concept which envisages a much more homogeneous society. Proposed elimination of the bilingual ballot and cutbacks in bilingual education are viewed as part of the same movement. Political implications of the amendment as well as implications for the teaching of English as a Second Language are examined. A bibliography of over 220 items is appended. (MSE)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED312904

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Cline H

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

Is There a Hidden Agenda?
The English Language Amendment

by

Herman H. Cline
Associate Professor

FL018239

City College of the City University of New York, 1989

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Suggested partial resume of the ERIC document: Is There a Hidden Agenda? The English Language Amendment by Herman H. Cline.

THIS PAPER IS BASED ON RESEARCH THAT TRIED TO FIND OUT WHAT THE HIDDEN AGENDA IS BEHIND THE ENGLISH-ONLY MOVEMENT. THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AMENDMENT (ELA) ADVOCATES HAVE CAUSED MUCH CONTROVERSY OVER THE PAST SEVERAL YEARS AND ARE STILL PRESSING THEIR CAUSE. THE GROUPS BEHIND THE ELA TRY TO ADVANCE THEIR PROPOSALS BY APPEALING TO THE TRADITIONS OF THE AMERICAN VALUE SYSTEM. THEY OPPOSE THE "SALAD BOWL" CONCEPT AND PROMOTE THE "MELTING POT."

BESIDES WISHING TO MAKE ENGLISH THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE OF THE UNITED STATES, ADVOCATES OF THE ELA DESIRE TO ELIMINATE THE "BILINGUAL BALLOT" AND SEVERELY CUTBACK "BILINGUAL EDUCATION."

THE DOCUMENT CONTAINS A THOROUGH WORKING BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE ENTIRE SPECTRUM OF THE ELA ADVOCACY.

Since the election on November 3, 1988, three additional states have passed initiatives, propositions, referenda to make English the official language of their respective states as well as of the entire United States. This brings the total number of states to seventeen that have passed such legislation. This fact coupled with the proposed English Language Amendment to the U. S. Constitution presented as the Senate and House Joint Resolution 72 in the 97th Congress and re-submitted in September 1983 as Senate Joint Resolution 167 shows the often contentious clash between those advocates of the melting pot versus the salad bowl.

The wording of the English Language Amendments should be noted. The Senate Joint Resolution simply states:

Section 1--The English language shall be the official language of the United States.

Section 2--The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The House Joint Resolution is more explicit in its wording than its Senate counter-part:

Section 1--The English language shall be the official language in the United States.

Section 2--Neither the United States nor any State shall require by law, ordinance, regulation, order, decree, program, or policy, the use in the United States of any language other than English.

Section 3--This article shall not prohibit any law, ordinance, regulation, order, decree, program, or policy, requiring educational instruction in a language other than English proficient in English.

Section 4--The Congress and the States may enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

How did this phenomenon of the English-Only movement arise to become such a large and controversial issue on the American agenda? Partly, it has been around before in other guises in different periods of our history. What has launched this new wave of agitation can be traced to a variety of historical, social, economic and political factors. The movement can be initially linked to an ophthalmologist named John H. Tanton from Petoskey, Michigan. He has activist roots in Michigan's environmental movement. (Cooper, 1986) He staunchly espouses the view that those allowed to move here should "melt" quickly into society. "I'm a great believer in trying to emphasize the similarities among people," he said. (Cooper, 1986) Tanton founded a lobbying group called the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR). This occurred after he was national President of Zero Population Growth (ZPG) when he tried to lead the organization into an area largely neglected in consideration of population growth, i. e., immigration. When ZPG resisted, he persuaded some of its financial backers to help him set up FAIR in 1979.

During 1981-82, while Tanton spent 10 months in Washington, D. C., as FAIR's fundraiser, he met S. I. (Sam) Hayakawa, who at that time was a Republican Senator from California. Hayakawa was backing a constitutional amendment to make English the nation's official language. Tanton adopted this cause as well and argued

increasing immigration threatens not only the environment but also the pre-eminence of English in America. Upon returning to Petoskey in 1983, Tanton set up U. S. English with the stated goal of passing Hayakawa's amendment. Another stated goal of U. S. English is to end bilingual election ballots and to scale back bilingual education programs.

One of the pillars of U. S. English is a work written by S. I. Hayakawa with the title One Nation Indivisible? The English Language Amendment. In the preface appears the statement:

"This monograph written by Dr. Samuel I. Hayakawa, the renowned educator, linguist, and former U. S. Senator is published by the Washington Institute for Values in Public Policy. The Institute was founded in 1982. It is an independent, non-profit educational and research organization which examines current and upcoming issues with particular attention to ethical implications. The paper was first presented on March 12, 1985, as part of the Bicentennial Forum Series on Constitutional Values and Contemporary Policy sponsored by the Washington Institute and moderated by Dr. Nicholas N. Kittrie, Edwin A. Mooers Scholar and Professor of Law at American University. The Institute sponsors research that helps provide the information and fresh insights necessary for formulating policy in a democratic society."
(Hayakawa, 1985)

The monograph states in the foreward that at that time Dr. Samuel I. Hayakawa was Special Adviser to the Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs. He remains the honorary chairman of U. S. English, whose purpose is to make English the official language of the United States.

Hayakawa argues that what "has made a society out

4

of the hodge-podge of nationalities, races and colors represented in the immigrant hordes that people our nation" is language. To quote him further: "with a common language ... we have dissolved distrust and fear. It is with language that we have drawn up the understandings and agreements and social contracts that make a society possible." Mention is made of Israel Zangwill's play, The Melting Pot, which opened in New York in 1908 to enthusiastic popular acclaim, and its title, "was seized upon as a concise evocation of a profoundly significant American fact."

On page 8 Hayakawa makes the main point of his talk recorded in this booklet. "In the past several years strong resistance to the "melting pot" idea has arisen, especially from those who claim to speak for the Hispanic peoples. Instead of a "melting pot," they say, the national ideal should be a "salad bowl," in which different elements are thrown together but not "melted" so that the original ingredients retain their distinctive character."

He continues to trace this new concept of the "salad bowl" to the following causes: (1) the increasing size of the Spanish-speaking population in our nation and (2) to two legislative actions taken mainly on behalf of Spanish language speakers and Hispanic culture. The first action was the so-called "bilingual ballot" mandated in 1975 in an amendment to the Voting Rights Act, which required foreign-language ballots when voters of selected foreign-language groups reached five percent or more of any voting

district. The groups chosen to be so "favored" were Asian-Americans (Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean), American Indians, Alaskan Natives, and "peoples of Spanish heritage," that is, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and Mexican-Americans.

Hayakawa accuses this singling out to be a form of profound racism expressed in the amendment that created the "bilingual ballot." He states: "Brown people, like Mexicans and Puerto Ricans, red people, like American Indians, and yellow people, like the Japanese and Chinese, are assumed not to be smart enough to learn English. No provision is made, however, for non-English-speaking French-Canadians in Maine or Vermont, nor for the Yiddish-speaking Hassidic Jews in Brooklyn, who are white and are presumed to be able to learn English without difficulty." He believes that when voters encountered the ballots in Spanish and Chinese for the first time in the elections of 1980, naturalized Americans, who had taken the trouble to learn English to become citizens were especially angry and remain so.

The second action that Hayakawa traces to an effort on behalf of the Spanish language is the Lau decision of the U. S. Supreme Court. This suit was brought about by a Chinese citizen of San Francisco who complained that his children were not being taught English adequately in the public schools. Justice William O. Douglas, delivering the opinion of the Court (Lau et al. v. Nichols et al., January 21, 1974) wrote:

This class suit brought by non-English-Chinese students against... the San Francisco Unified School District seeks relief against the unequal educational opportunities which are alleged to violate, inter alia, the Fourteenth Amendment. No specific remedy is urged upon us. Teaching English to the students of Chinese ancestry who do not speak the language is one choice. Giving instructions to this group in Chinese is another. There may be others. Petitioners ask only that the Board of Education be directed to apply its expertise to the problem and rectify the situation.

After the Lau petition was granted because it did not specify the method by which English was to be taught, Hayakawa believes that not the Chinese but the Hispanics used it as a go-ahead for "amazing educational developments" and "appropriated the decision and took it to apply especially to themselves." Hayakawa goes on to say: "The new Department of Education, established during the Carter administration, was eager to make its presence known by expanding its bureaucracy and its influence. The Department quickly announced a vast program with federal funding for bilingual education, which led to the hiring of Spanish-speaking teachers by the thousands." (Hayakawa, 1985)

The Department issued what have become known as the "Lau regulations," that required under the threat of withdrawal of federal funds that (1) non-English-speaking pupils be taught English, and that (2) academic subjects be taught in the pupils' own language. Hayakawa feels that there is a contradiction between these two regulations and, he states, it does not seem to trouble to this day the huge membership of the National Association for

Bilingual Education. The actual statistics refute this huge membership assertion on Hayakawa's part. In the 23rd edition of the Encyclopedia of Associations published in 1989, the membership of NABE was given as 3,000. The membership of U. S. English is listed as 240,000. He states that bilingual education became a "growth industry" and that complaints arose from citizens that bilingual education was not bilingual at all, since many Spanish-speaking teachers hired for the program were found not to be able to speak English. This, according to Hayakawa, caused the Department of Education to decree "that teachers in the "bilingual" programs do not need to know English!" (Hayakawa, 1985) He finds a parallel in the above to the fact that Hispanic students drop out of school educated neither in Hispanic nor in American language and culture. He quotes from an American Council on Education report that "Hispanics are the least educated minority in America... fifty percent of all Hispanic youths in America drop out of high school, and only seven percent finish college. Twelve percent of black youths and twenty-three percent of whites finish college. Eighteen percent of all Hispanics in America who are twenty-five or older are classified as functional illiterates, compared to ten percent for blacks and three percent for whites." In the same work, Hayakawa believes that the "ethnic chauvinism of the present Hispanic leadership is an unhealthy trend in present-

day America. It threatens a division perhaps more ominous in the long run than the division between blacks and whites." He goes on to state that: "Blacks and whites have problems enough with each other, to be sure, but they quarrel with each other in one language. Even Malcolm X, in his fiery denunciations of the racial situation in America, wrote excellent and eloquent English." (Hayakawa, 1985)

Hayakawa feels the present politically ambitious "Hispanic Caucus" looks forward to a separate destiny from that of all other ethnic minorities and many are not disturbed at the large numbers of Hispanics who do not speak English and have no intention of learning it. He sees the Spanish-language "Yellow Pages" telephone directory as a bad omen. He quotes a few Hispanic leaders out of context by their statements, such as "Let's face it. We are not going to be a totally English-speaking country any more." This point has never been true in our entire history as a nation. Examples abound from our earliest days as a new democracy in the eighteenth century to the present times of large groups of non-English speakers with their own schools and communities. Examples of some of these are: (Castro, 1976)

In early Federal history:

- 1804 French, English, and Spanish used in the local courts.
- 1806 Federal laws were printed in French for the first time. Later provision required all laws applicable to Louisiana Territory to be printed in both French and English.
- 1848 Treaty of Peace, Friendship, Limits and Settlement

with the Republic of Mexico (Guadalupe Hidalgo) - Spanish speaking citizens accorded "rights and privileges of citizenship."

- 1850 Initial organic act governing Territory of New Mexico was passed without recognizing that over one-half of the population was of Spanish-speaking descent.
- 1853 Congress authorized the New Mexico Assembly to employ a translator, interpreter and two clerks for each house in order to accomodate the Spanish-speaking populace of the territory.
- 1884 Congress authorized funds for the (Spanish) translation of bills, laws, and journals of the territory's legislature, on condition that the legislative proceedings, records, and laws of the territory be printed in English.
- 1897 United States acquired Hawaii and shortly after introduced English into legal and educational systems.
- 1900 Initial organic act passed for Hawaii which directed that all legislative proceedings be conducted in the English language. Initially laws published in English and Hawaiian but later were published only in English. Within a year after the acquisition of Puerto Rico, the United States officially established English together with Spanish as official languages of the island.
- 1903 Attempt was made by the United States to impose English as the sole medium of instruction at all school levels in Puerto Rico.
- 1911 New Mexico's constitution required the ballots for its ratification to be printed in both Spanish and English, the laws of its legislature to be printed in both languages for twenty years following ratification, and teachers to be trained in Spanish to teach Spanish-speaking pupils.
- 1916 In the Phillipines a literacy test for voting was imposed, but test could be met by a knowledge of Spanish, English, or a native language.
- 1919 Federal government required all teaching in public and private schools in Hawaii to be in English, but Hawaiian could be taught in addition to English in the high schools. Governor of Hawaii, an executive branch appointee, initiated legislation to severely limit the operation of private foreign language

schools which were used as cultural supplements to public schools. There was an unexpected outcry against the legislation.

1920 Survey of Education in Hawaii subjected private foreign language schools to careful scrutiny and recommended their abolition unless re-established in the future by the Territorial Department of Education upon evidence of sufficient demand.

1923 Legislation passed regulating foreign language schools and the teaching of foreign languages; the declared purpose was to foster Americanization. Law subjected schools and teachers to licensing and regulation; schools limited to one hour a day with courses, texts, attendance and age of pupils prescribed by Territorial Department of Education in Hawaii. Teachers were required to speak, read and write English and to be versed in American History.

Supreme Court made clear in Meyer v. Nebraska that the prohibition or undue inhibition of the use or teaching of a foreign language is an unconstitutional violation of due process. It also assumed, however, that a state statutory requirement of English instruction in public and private schools was permitted by the Constitution.

1926 Supreme Court in Yu Cong Eng v. Trinidad interpreted a statute which was passed by the Philippine legislature and known as the Chinese Bookkeeping Act, as a complete prohibition on books in languages other than Spanish, English or a local dialect and therefore held the law unconstitutional. The ruling was limited to the Philippine Islands and the unique situation of Chinese persons in the business world there.

1927 Territorial legislation of 1923 was declared unconstitutional in the case of Farrington v. To Kushige and official severance was made between private foreign language schools and public authorities.

1934 United States granted independence to the Philippine Islands, the grant to become effective ten years later. Despite the envisioned break, the United States insisted that in the interim ten years, the public schools continue to conduct their instruction in English.

Language became volatile political issue in Puerto

Rico, as the federal government pressed for recognition of English despite local resistance.

Recent Federal History:

- 1940 Nationality Act--spoken English required for naturalization.
- 1945 Educational policy placed in hands of local officials of Puerto Rico; Spanish was re-established as the medium of instruction at all educational levels.
- 1950 Louisiana law emphasized English; legal notices need only be published in English, juror qualifications based on English, various business records must be in English, and instruction in public schools must be conducted in English. Yet, every contract executed in French declared valid.

1940 Act Amendment--federal code established English literacy as a condition for naturalization. People who were over 50 years of age and residents in the United States for 20 years were exempt.
- 1959 Hawaii became a state and the law regulating private foreign language schools was dropped.
- 1965 Official bilingual posture of Puerto Rico, established in 1900, limited by a judicial decision interpreting statute as only advisory in the case where an attorney wished to address the court in English.
- 1967 Title VII of Elementary and Secondary Education Act -- \$85 million authorized to work with special problems of children from "environments where the dominant language is other than English."
- 1969 Louisiana constitution revised to provide that a candidate for office or a voter must be able to read and write the English language or his mother tongue.

It can be seen from the above facts that the nation is not now nor has it ever been a totally English-speaking country.

Hayakawa goes on to quote material out of context and in most cases unattributed to an exact person and

place at a given time. Examples are: "Spanish should be included in commercials shown throughout America." "Every American child ought to be taught both English and Spanish." "Citizenship is what makes us all American. Language is not necessary to the system. Nowhere does the Constitution say that English is our language." It is from the latter statement accredited to Maurice Ferre, former mayor of Miami, Florida, which prompted Hayakawa to introduce in April, 1981 a constitutional amendment which read as follows:

"Article--

Section 1. The English language shall be the official language of the United States.

Section 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

The quarterly record of legislative activities for the period describes the proposed legislation as follows:

Senator Hayakawa introduced S. J. Res. 72... The emphasis of SIH's floor statement was that a common language can unify; separate languages can fracture and fragment a society. Senator Hayakawa believes that this amendment is needed to clarify the confusing signals we have given in recent years to immigrant groups. The requirements to become a naturalized citizen say you must be able to speak, read and write words in the English language. And though you must be a citizen to vote, some recent legislation has required bilingual ballots in some areas. This amendment would end that contradictory and logically conflicting situation.

Although there were ten co-sponsors to this resolution, and some speeches were given on the Senate floor, it died without being acted upon in the 97th

Congress.

In the 98th Congress, in September, 1983, the English Language Amendment was re-submitted (S. J. Res. 167) by Senator Walter Huddleston (D, KY). In his introductory speech he said:

As a nation of immigrants, our great strength has been drawn from our ability to assimilate... people from many different cultures... But for the last fifteen years, we have experienced a growing resistance to the acceptance of our historic language, an antagonistic questioning of the melting pot philosophy. (Congressional Record-Senate, September 21, 1983)

Senator Huddleston goes on to quote Theodore H. White's book, America in Search of Itself:

Some Hispanics have... made a demand never voiced before: that the United States, in effect, officially recognize itself as a bicultural, bilingual nation... (They) demand that the United States become a bilingual country, with all children entitled to be taught in the language of their heritage, at public expense. (Congressional Record-Senate, September 21, 1983)

On June 12, 1984, the Senate Subcommittee on the Constitution, with Senator Orrin Hatch (R, UT) presiding, held a hearing on Senator Huddleston's amendment, at which several witnesses presented their views. Hayakawa was among those witnesses. However, no further action was taken by the 98th Congress.

In January, 1985, the English Language Amendment was introduced again, this time by Senator Steve Symms (R, ID). In his introductory remarks, he stated two points not previously made explicit, although certainly

implied; (1) that the amendment is not intended to regulate language usage between private parties, and (2) that it is not intended to discourage the use of foreign languages in diplomacy or trade. As he said at the time:

The English Language Amendment is intended to stop the practice of voting in foreign languages; it is intended to teach children who don't know English through appropriate programs...; it is intended to make English the only language for official proceedings of governments at all levels...; it is intended to make the acceptance of English a condition of statehood incumbent upon all territories aspiring to that status. (Congressional Record-Senate, February 19, 1985)

In the House of Representatives the English Language Amendment was offered by Robert K. Dornan (R, CA) in the 97th Congress, and by Norman Shumway (R, CA) in subsequent Congresses.

Hayakawa states that the English Language Amendment is likely to suffer an occasional setback in state legislatures because of the doctrinaire liberals' assumption that every demand made by an ethnic minority must be yielded to. When it has been submitted to a popular referendum or ballot initiative, it won by seventy percent or better except in Arizona in November, 1988, where it passed by fifty-one percent. He states that no other groups other than Hispanics pressure against English language legislation. This is simply not true as shown by statements against the English Language Amendment made by several professional organizations representing a more diverse population than Hispanics. He quotes other areas of the globe where

linguistic division has torn apart the fabric of the nation: Canada, Belgium, Sri Lanka. This has been caused by political differences becoming hardened and being made immeasurably more difficult to resolve when they are accompanied by differences of language and, therefore, proponents of the English Language Amendment believe causes conflicts of ethnic pride. Hayakawa's argument is that there is "an aggressive movement on the part of Hispanics to reject assimilation and to seek to maintain--and give official status to - a foreign language within our borders." (Hayakawa, 1985).

This foreign language and culture are not to be maintained through private means but by federal and state legislation and funding. Two prime bodies Hayakawa sights as responsible for this are the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and the energetic lobbying done by the National Association for Bilingual Education. The basic directive of the Lau decision according to Hayakawa has been diverted from its original purpose of teaching English. Hayakawa's remedy for this situation is to create a well-endowed National English Language Foundation to help the non-English speaking population become more proficient. He feels that there is an internal threat to the nation's unity. The foundation could be used to strengthen adult education programs for English language instruction by television or radio and to open English-language centers in communities where none exist, offering day and evening

classes to all who wish them.

A most interesting point made by the linguist Dr. Hayakawa is that "unfettered by the conventional requirements of credentials and diplomas, such a Foundation can use novel methods, find teaching talent in unlikely people, and explore new approaches to the great problems involved." He states that the Foundation would be open to non-English-speaking American citizens as well as non-English speaking aliens who hope to become citizens. A modest tuition fee would be charged and after the pupil passes the final English language competency test, a diploma would be awarded and the tuition fee might well be refunded. In citing authorities to counter the accusation that the campaign for the English-Only agenda is isolationist, even racist, Hayakawa refers to President Theodore Roosevelt when he said:

We have room for but one language here, and that is the English language, for we intend to see that the crucible turns our people out as Americans... No more hyphenated Americans.

The time and reasons that Roosevelt made this point do not fit into the context of the present. He quotes Emma Lazarus and her poem inscribed on the Statue of Liberty. Hayakawa further states: "In reply to those who say that there is nothing wrong with having two languages nationally, I quote some remarks made by one who is a fellow-Canadian, and who has had a successful

career in the United States, Fred L. Hartley, president of the Union Oil Company of California:"

My native Canada is a land of two official languages, a circumstance that has proved more and more disastrous to Canada's progress and unity. At this moment (November 21, 1983) there is not a single member of the party in power in the federal capital at Ottawa who represents the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Let us learn from this example and formally establish and maintain one official English language so that all can fully participate and communicate in our society with one tongue.
(Address before a meeting of the Thomas Jefferson Center, Los Angeles, November 21, 1983)

Hayakawa does not sufficiently point out what is so bad about Mr. Hartley's remarks. In the United States as well, especially regionally, this situation has been true too throughout our history. The monograph ends with a statement attributed to the American novelist, Saul Bellow who served on the advisory board of U. S. English:

"Melting pot, yes. Tower of Babel, no!

Ethnic Diversity and Bilingual Education

In justifying his case for the English Language Amendment, Hayakawa first feels it necessary to qualify the "familiar truism," as he calls it, that characterizes the United States as "a nation of immigrants." He does concede that we are a nation of immigrants but not a nation of separate immigrant enclaves. This point could be challenged as any of our larger metropolitan areas attest. The sections of urban areas referred to as Chinatowns, Little Italy, Ukraine, Poland and Spanish Harlem, to name only a few, would counter his statement. Rather, he believes we are a country composed of various racial, cultural, linguistic, and ethnic groups constantly undergoing integration and assimilation and, thereby, constantly creating a new culture influenced by-- even evolved from -- diverse heritages. That concept is the melting pot.

He goes on to point out that in the past few years, strong resistance to the melting pot idea has arisen-- especially among those who claim to speak for our Hispanic-American citizens. Instead of a melting pot they say the national ideal should be a salad bowl, in which different elements do not melt but mingle, retaining their distinctive character. Hayakawa attacks bilingual education, which he feels is a key element in the "salad bowl agenda." He states that concept encourages the maintenance of, and primary allegiance to, the Spanish

language among Hispanics. He notes that a great deal of confusion exists over the term "bilingual education." Bilingualism can mean anything from knowing two languages, a feat we all would heartily applaud he states, to binationalism, a course our country must escape. On this point he tries to frighten his audience by comparing the future fate of the United States to all the negative information relating to other countries with language minorities like Canada, Belgium, and even Sri Lanka.

Again he feels that bilingual education means something quite specific to many who say they speak for Hispanics. For example: He uses the following statements to prove his point, "The present monolingual, monocultural, Anglocentric public education system must be replaced by a multilingual, multicultural, pluralistic one," according to Robert Cordova, an assistant professor at the University of Northern Colorado. "The Hispanic population is becoming larger, and Hispanic culture is becoming stronger... American society and ideas of old no longer exist." The fact that this statement is taken out of context does not seem to bother the scholar Hayakawa. In addition, he quotes, Spanish should be included in commercials shown throughout America. Every American child ought to be taught both English and Spanish," says Mario Obledo, president of the League of United Latin American Citizens, a group originally founded to help Hispanics learn English. Again this quote is taken out of context.

Another example Hayakawa uses is, "If the present rate of growth of Spanish speakers continues, it is not unlikely that we will soon have to consider a law making both English and Spanish the official U. S. languages a possibility," said Josue Gonzales, now president of the National Association for Bilingual Education, in testimony before Congress over a decade ago.

Former Senator Hayakawa uses these quotes to support his contention that there is a very real move afoot to split the U. S. into a bilingual and bicultural society. He believes this move is being spear-headed, not by rank-and-file Hispanics, but by their political leaders, by certain bilingual teachers, and by Hispanic lobbying organizations. These are the villains for Hayakawa although, except for a few quotes taken out of context, he does not document his charges against any of these groups, which he so categorically condemns.

Since Hayakawa was deeply concerned, as he states by the specter of a country divided along linguistic and cultural lines, he was driven to introduce in the U. S. Senate in April, 1981, the constitutional amendment that would establish English as the official national language. Each successive year other Senators have introduced the same amendment. He makes the emotional appeal and distorts the facts and states without documentation that approximately half the voters of Hispanic background usually support the English Language Amendment

and the referenda in the various states where it has appeared on the ballot.

To his critics that he says try to tar him with a wide brush as a xenophobe or racist, he replies that neither he nor his supporters endeavor to segregate children and society along racial or linguistic lines. He further offers as a defense that he is a nonwhite immigrant, as well as three of the six members of the board of U. S. English, that all board members know at least one language other than English, which he feels is hardly the sort of people likely to embrace xenophobia. As his credo, since he is concerned about the future unity of the United States, he has taken the stand that Americans must share a common language and that language must be English. He does not recognize that using a child's native language might advance his/her education under some circumstances, but with two provisos; (1) bilingual education must be chosen freely by local school authorities, not imposed by federal or state governments and (2) the bilingual education program must be truly transitional, preparing the student for transfer into a standard English classroom after one or not more than two years.

He finally ends the article with the old cliché that countless millions of immigrants successfully made the transition from their native tongues to English and became assimilated into the American mainstream. "It is condescending and insulting to single out today's immigrants and suggest they cannot do the same." (Hayakawa, 1987)

This last statement is a type of play on racism by an indirect attack and in and of itself is bigoted.

English Language Amendment Supporters

The debate over whether English should be the official language of the United States is not new. At the time of independence the reasons for not naming an official language included a belief in tolerance for linguistic diversity within the population, the economic and social value of foreign language knowledge to the citizenry, and a desire not to restrict the linguistic and cultural freedom of those living in the new country. Language use was considered a matter of personal choice to be made by each individual and not an issue for governmental intervention. Freedom of choice in language also had the pragmatic advantages of serving to attract new immigrants to the young nation and of disseminating information on the new country to those who spoke languages other than English.

Following the early debate, the issue of a national language for the United States remained quiescent until quite recently. That is not to say that language rights for non-English speakers have never been an issue. In the 200-year period between the initial Revolutionary-era debate and the current revival of the issue, the country has undergone periods ranging from tolerance for the use of languages other than English, in both the pre-Civil War era and in the 1960's, to attempts at linguistic and

cultural repression of those who spoke non-English tongues. Most notably this repression occurred in the period during and immediately after World War I. Attempts at literacy requirements and quota systems for immigrants attest to anti-foreigner sentiments in the United States, especially against non-northern European groups. In Congress itself, the issue of a national language was not specifically raised, nor were there any legislative proposals either to designate English as the official language or to bar officially any other languages. The Supreme Court did rule against state attempts to ban forcing foreign languages in the schools, most notably in Meyer v. Nebraska (1923). These cases involved state efforts to impose language restrictions, not an attempt to change the U. S. Constitution.

In the present debate, the following statements have been read into the Congressional Record by proponents of the English Language Amendment:

For over 200 years, the United States has enjoyed the blessing of one primary language that is spoken and understood by most of its citizens. The previous unquestioned acceptance of this language by immigrants from every linguistic and cultural background has enabled us to come together and prosper as one people. It has allowed us to discuss our differences, to argue about problems, and to compromise on solutions. Moreover, it has allowed us to develop a stable and cohesive society that is the envy of many fractured ones. (Huddleston, 1984)

America is a nation of immigrants. Our greatness has stemmed from our ability to assimilate vast numbers of people from many different cultures. (Shumway, 1984)

We are enhancing these dissimilarities between immigrants and the mainstream of American life, thereby inhibiting the vital acculturation that must occur. (Shumway, 1984)

The Amendment preempts any further attempt to politicize language. It would not threaten the vulnerable American tradition of polyculturalism. Ironically, only a common tongue can preserve that tradition. Only a common tongue can bind together a nation made up of little nations. (Symms, 1984)

The American people are impatient with us. All around them they see the result of language policies that Congress has imposed, policies that challenge the uniqueness of English in our national life. We have removed the heat from the "melting pot," and the melting seems to have nearly stopped. Many Americans now feel like strangers in their own neighborhoods, aliens in their own country. (Symms, 1985)

The bilingual policy of the government is discriminatory in nature. There is no room for upward mobility in a society if one does not speak the language. Were English to become the official language of the United States, however, all immigrants, all of our citizens, would be stimulated to learn English. (Denton, 1984)

The above statements indicate the thinking of the supporters of the English Language Amendment and their agenda. In general, advocates of the English Language Amendment do not seem to support cultural pluralism. They see the melting pot as the ideal American philosophy and goal. They seem to fear that if non-English-speaking communities flourish, the United States runs the risk of encouraging political disunity and even political disintegration. Senator Huddleston argued that failure to declare English as the official language would result in "ethnic confrontation and cultural separatism,"

while Senator Symms stated that "without a common tongue, the United States faces the prospect of Balkanization and linguistic separation."

Justification for the fears of disunity and separatism in the United States is ostensibly bolstered by the experiences of other multi-lingual countries. The proponents of the English Language Amendment consistently point to cases of polarization, ethnic antagonisms, and demands for political autonomy in countries like Canada, Belgium, and Sri Lanka. They claim that a similar fate awaits the United States unless English is constitutionally declared the official language.

Other arguments advanced by the proponents of the English Language Amendment relate to discrimination and segregation. They believe that current policies which allow for the use of languages other than English encourage immigrants not to learn English. These people as a result are kept on the fringe of America's English-speaking mainstream and encounter social and economic discrimination because of their ignorance of the English language. They remain segregated from the dominant English speaking majority and cannot fully participate in the vast riches that American society has to offer. Only by declaring English the official language and abolishing federal and state policies that encourage the use of languages other than English will people be forced to learn English. Thus, in the view of English Language Amendment supporters, a

constitutional amendment making English the official language is a way of abolishing discrimination and segregation caused by language, just as similar constitutional amendments abolished discrimination based on race.

Those supporting the English Language Amendment are quick to remind people that they are not against certain uses of languages other than English in the United States. They support foreign language instruction and the use of languages other than English in cases of public safety and health services. They also see nothing wrong in the use of court interpreters for people who do not speak English or in the government's use of languages other than English for matters relating to international affairs and diplomacy. (Judd, 1987) However, they feel that laws, regulations, and rules permitting or encouraging the use of languages other than English have been overapplied in many other areas and that this discourages people from learning English, since they can obtain services without mastering the language. Furthermore, some supporters see these laws and policies as just another attempt by the federal government to impose bureaucratic regulations on local authorities to hinder individual communities from devising their own solutions to local problems.

The two policies that supporters of the English Language Amendment find most irksome are those relating to bilingual education and the bilingual ballot. Most English Language Amendment proponents claim that they

are not against all forms of bilingual education. Many believe that the Bilingual Education Act which was designed to provide a transitional method of education for non-English speakers has been converted into a program advocating maintenance of native languages and cultures at the expense of learning English. They feel such a program causes children not to learn English and not to become a part of the wider American society.

A policy of transitional bilingual education with no provisions for native culture or language maintenance and no teaching of the content areas in languages other than English, will, according to Senator Symms "reestablish Congress' original intent in passing the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 i. e., to teach students English as rapidly as possible so that they may more fully enjoy the blessings America offers." (Judd, 1987) According to Representative Shumway the passage of the English Language Amendment would "make clear to immigrant parents and children alike that mastery of English is indispensable for one's becoming a full member of American society."

In Senator Symm's view, current federal policy on bilingual education is causing students to become "illiterate in two languages" and is deceiving parents and cheating children "of their future when we lull them into thinking that English is not necessary to make it in America." Studies are cited by the pro English Language Amendment, anti-bilingual education forces to show that the current

bilingual policy is failing and that new governmental policies need to be adopted. Their general position on bilingual education can best be summed up by Senator Burdick:

The goal for all non-English-speaking Americans should be to learn English. To the extent that bilingual education achieves this goal, it is good. But to the extent that bilingual education stalls this process, and to the extent that it allows a person to get along comfortably without knowing English, it is bad.

The provision for bilingual ballots began in 1975 as an amendment to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to provide access to election materials in communities with a considerable number of non-English speakers. Supporters of the English Language Amendment are unanimous in their opposition to such ballots. They argue that people cannot make an informal choice in elections if they do not know English, that such ballots make minority members easy prey to bloc voting by special interest groups, that in effect the provision is contradictory to citizenship laws which require fluency in English, since there is no incentive to learn English if ballots are provided in another language. Former Senator Huddleston's words are typical of this stance:

By failing to provide a positive incentive for voting citizens to learn English, we are denying them full participation in the political process. Instead, we are making them dependent upon a few interpreters or go-betweens for information as to how they should vote. Although this process helps

to preserve minority voting blocs, it seriously undercuts the democratic concept that every voting individual should be as fully informed as possible about the issues and the candidates.

Thus bilingual education and bilingual ballots are seen by English Language Amendment supporters as the beginning of the societal disunity discussed earlier. To quote former Senator Huddleston again:

I see bilingual education and the misuse of it, and the bilingual ballot as just an early manifestation of a much deeper and serious problem, and that is the whole question of a bilingual or multi-cultural society in this country. And while we might pass legislation that would address those two situations, it seems to me that the proper way to settle the question for future generations is to go the constitutional route of designating English as the official language of the country.

Those opposing the need for a constitutional amendment to make English the official language do so on several stands. Some challenge the facts presented by English Language Amendment supporters and the English Language Amendment lobby group, U. S. English, as an odd mixture of shallow information, misinformation, tangled logic, illogic and xenophobia. (Donahue, 1985) Some question the motives behind the English Language Amendment, while others raise legal questions arising from a new constitutional amendment.

The assertion that the U. S. is a melting pot has been widely challenged as misrepresenting historical reality. A blanket generalization that either linguistic/cultural assimilation or monolingualism is a force in

American political stability is a misinformed representation of historical reality. Drawing analogies with multilingual countries in other parts of the world and claim parallels to what might happen in the United States does not present a situation comparable with that in the United States.

Canada, the favorite example of the English Language Amendment advocates, does not present a situation comparable with that in the U. S. First of all, Canada is an officially bilingual country; the United States is not. The complaints of the francophone population arose from cases of linguistic repression of French Canadians rather than from tolerance for the use of the French language. (Maldoff, 1986) In Quebec we are talking not about having one language on the one hand and having national greatness on the other, nor between having an official language on the one hand and decreasing the rate of non-English illegal immigration on the other. Huddleston's arguments are too rhetorical.

One of the watersheds in the controversy surrounding the English Language Amendment was a debate held in Philadelphia on May 2, 1987, held between Gerda Bikales, former Executive Director of U. S. English and Tony Califa of the American Civil Liberties Union. Some of the points made are as follows: Even though seventeen states have passed English-only amendments, in 1987 nineteen other states rejected such proposals. Such laws could result

in the banning of bilingual ballots and bilingual education and deprive non-English speakers of vital services by eliminating government translators. The English-only language laws passed around the country are overruled when they conflict with existing federal legislation.

One distinction that should be made is a difference between "national" language and "official" language. A United Nations document makes the distinction. "A national language is 'the language of a social and cultural entity which is in widespread use in a country'; an official language, by contrast, is a language used in the business of government (legislative, executive, administrative and judicial) and in the performances of the various other functions of the state."

A Declaration of English as the official language seems innocent enough. However, language minority people would be denied (1) the right to vote (2) the right to equal educational opportunity (3) the right to due process in criminal proceedings (4) the right to equality in civil proceedings (5) access to health care and (6) access to information and entertainment. In addition, advocates of English-only want to deprive businesses of their right to advertise their products in foreign languages.

The United States courts have recognized serious problems in English only voting. They have declined to make English literacy a prerequisite for voting. By passing the bilingual ballot provisions of the Voting Rights

Act, Congress recognized that English only ballots disenfranchised American citizens. The State of New Mexico has provided bilingual ballots to its voters since 1912. It has the highest election voter turnout in the country and a high participation level by Hispanics in elective office. By eliminating bilingual ballots, a clear message is given to those citizens who do not read and speak English well. You should not participate in the American democratic process.

As to the English-only movement's opposition to bilingual education, in order for children to learn English and not fall behind in subject matter areas, bilingual is and always has been a way for children to learn. Nearly all bilingual education in the United States is transitional. Its purpose is to make children so fluent in English that they can participate profitably in an English speaking class. The great majority of children are in "regular" classes conducted in English within one to three years. Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) has proven to be very successful. Studies by the Department of Education, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), and the General Accounting Office have shown that, on average Limited English Proficient children in TBE classes do better than children in English Immersion classes. They do better in their subject matter areas. They also do better in English. Criticism of bilingual education often stresses that transition

periods are too long. Even though these children often scored higher than district wide averages in all areas, the opponents are coming out against high educational achievement based on ideological grounds, not educational grounds in stressing the length of the transitional period. The "sink or swim" theory is at full bloom here.

In the area of criminal justice, if the English Language Amendment were to be ratified, the Court Interpreters Act, only a statute, would be unconstitutional. We could have cases like Ex Rel Negron v. New York. In that case, the defendant was an uneducated, indigent Puerto Rican, a citizen of the United States. He could not speak or understand English. His court appointed lawyer could not speak or understand Spanish. Twelve of fourteen witnesses testified in English. Negron could not understand their testimony.

The Second Circuit held that the Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution had been violated because the defendant, who had received a sentence of life imprisonment, could not cross-examine witnesses against him. The Court wrote:

Particularly inappropriate in this nation where many languages are spoken is a callousness to the crippling language handicap of a newcomer to its shores, whose life and freedom the state by its criminal processes chooses to put in jeopardy.

The English Language Amendment would also endanger the present practice, required by law, of giving Miranda

warnings in a language understood by the person who is accused. Remember, Miranda is the "poor man's Fifth." It's the indigent recent immigrant, not knowing English, and not knowing his protections under the Bill of Rights who is most helpless in custodial interrogation situations. In the civil area, the small advances that have been made would be abolished. Aliens seeking to enter the country legally would not be examined in their language.

Citizens who do not speak English well could be audited by the IRS in English, with no help permissible in their native language.

Many cities and states have recognized the need for bilingual dispatchers in the area of emergency medical services. The English Language Amendment would prohibit states from providing care to these people. U. S. English is in favor of local control in bilingual education and against it in emergency services.

U. S. English has attempted to "purify" the air waves by petitioning the Federal Communications Commission to ban Spanish language radio in South Texas. This would limit the flow of information and entertainment that is available to people. The FCC has dismissed the complaint as groundless. These are significant First Amendment issues here, since the First Amendment not only protects free speech but the right to receive information as well.

U. S. English has boycotted products of companies that advertise in Spanish on the grounds that English is somehow threatened. This is a counterproductive approach.

Advertising helps sell goods and creates wealth. Business should be free, short of obscenity, to sell goods and services. The consumer must be free to choose the information and entertainment that he wants.

Another reason why the English Language Amendment is an extreme goal is that the constitutional amendment process should not be used lightly. If there is a desire to examine and question the legitimacy or efficacy of the use of languages other than English, then this should be done in the legislative forum. If the main thrust of opposition is to prohibit bilingual education and bilingual ballots, then attack those items specifically.

Arguing that the new immigrants are not interested in learning English has not proven to be the case. The new immigrants, mainly Hispanic and Asian, often wish to learn English. The demand for English courses exceeds the supply.

An insulting premise that U. S. English uses is that immigrants must be forced to learn English. The way you would force them to learn English is to make English the official language. Declaring something official does not make people want to do it. Prohibition was a great failure although it was an amendment. Research studies have shown that Spanish speaking immigrant families are "crossing over" to English fluency in the same amount of time as it took other immigrant groups.

The contention that Hispanics and Asians are separ-

artists and owe their allegiance to other countries and not the United States and that English is the glue that holds us together does not hold up under scrutiny. The other assumptions made that English is under attack and is suffering erosion, so that by declaring English the official language to protect it we will not turn into separate countries, do not carry any credible validity. The devotion of these immigrants to the U. S. is very strong and under great hardship, many came to this country. The great majority of immigrants learn English.

The comparison with Quebec is not valid. Here everyone agrees that English is the national tongue. This is not true in Quebec. Here, no one is pushing for "the other language"--Spanish, to be an official language. Here, there is no seething resentment by one group of having suffered military conquest at the hands of the other group. In Quebec, there is this feeling.

The idea that war could start over language is not valid in a country like the United States. Most commonly, the cause is a history of discrimination and a feeling by the "out" group of having been treated unfairly. Northern Ireland and Lebanon are examples where both groups speak the same language. The Spanish and American Civil Wars nor the French or Russian Revolutions started over language. The proposed amendment hurts and exacerbates and divides people more than it unifies them. The English Language Amendment may be a cause of the problems it says it is

trying to avoid.

The spread of American culture, entertainment and science have made English the world's first language. English is a vigorous language that immigrants want to learn. Energy and enthusiasm for the English Language Amendment should be shifted to funding English literacy classes for adults. Better to stimulate people into learning than to force them. Hakuta has pointed out that inter-ethnic tensions have been the principal by-products of the passage of the official English bills. (Hakuta, 1986)

Rather than supporting legislation based on shaky evidence about the disintegration of the country because of bilingualism, look at the objective evidence. English is not an endangered language. Bilingual education is effective. Mandating an official language has been more divisive than helpful. Legal implications of an English only amendment are dangerous. The English Language Amendment is unnecessary. It will undermine effective services to the limited-English-speaking population and it could lead to, rather than ameliorate, inter-ethnic tensions. Thus the debate ended.

Since opponents of bilingual education are just as adamant against the bilingual ballot, it would be advantageous to have some research done in relation to groups benefitting from them and why they are needed. Chalsa M. Loo has filled that gap in a research article published in

1985. It is noteworthy that empirical support for assumptions made by English-only advocates was found lacking. (Loo, 1985) The article provides research data on language acquisition and acculturation of immigrants to test assumptions made by opponents of bilingual provisions.

The bilingual ballot was a provision of the 1975 amendments to the 1965 Voting Rights Act. The 1975 Amendment (Public Law No. 94-73) expanded the coverage of the special provisions to additional areas and required bilingual elections in certain areas. It reads as follows:

The Congress finds that, through the use of various practices and procedures, citizens of language minorities have been effectively excluded from participation in the electoral process. Among other factors, the denial of the right to vote of such minority group citizens is ordinarily directly related to the unequal educational opportunities afforded them, resulting in high illiteracy and low voting participation. The Congress declares that, in order to enforce the guarantees of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the United States Constitution, it is necessary to eliminate such discrimination by prohibiting these practices, and by describing other remedial devices.

Bilingual ballots were required of a state, or political subdivision of a state not covered as a whole, where more than five percent of the citizens of voting age of the jurisdiction were members of a single language minority group. Those groups covered are "persons who are American Indians, Alaskan natives, Asian Americans, or of Spanish heritage." "Asian American" includes Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, and Korean American citizens. "Persons of Spanish heritage" include persons of Spanish

language in 42 states and the District of Columbia; persons of Spanish language and persons of Spanish surname in Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas, and persons of Puerto Rican birth or parentage in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

California, where close to half the population is ethnic minority, the opposition to the provision of bilingual ballots is particularly under attack. In 1983, sixty-two percent of the voting San Franciscans approved Proposition 0, a resolution that sought to repeal the bilingual election provisions of the Voting Rights Act. In 1984, seventy-one percent of all voting Californians approved Proposition 38, an initiative that urged an amendment of Federal law so that ballots, voter pamphlets, and all other official voting materials would be printed in English only. Then the hostility culminated in Proposition 63 which passed in 1986 making English the Official Language of California.

Impetus for amendments to the 1965 Voting Rights Act came largely from evidence presented to Congress of acts designed to interfere with or abridge the rights of Mexican-American voters in Texas, a state not covered by the 1965 Act. To overcome possible objections of narrowness of legislation, the principles were generalized to provide coverage for other language minority groups. (Loo, 1985)

The intent of these amendments was to eliminate

discrimination in voting against language minority groups whose denied voting rights were assumed to result partly from unequal educational opportunities afforded them, thus creating low voter participation and high illiteracy.

Supporters of bilingual ballots argued that an enforced monolingual, monocultural society is contrary to democratic ideals. Specifically, they argued that:

a) English only ballots would unfairly prevent thousands of Americans who have difficulty with the English language from exercising their right to vote;

b) bilingual ballots encourage all citizens to participate in their government;

c) Hispanic and Asian-Americans want to learn English for they recognize it as one of the keys to economic advancement and social integration;

d) bilingual ballots and bilingual voters' pamphlets provide the opportunity for citizens to cast intelligent, responsible votes while they perfect their English;

e) bilingual elections are cost effective since they accounted for less than two percent of county election costs in Los Angeles and, in San Francisco, they cost the average homeowner less than .03 annually and;

Supporters of the English-only ballot hold the following positions:

a) bilingual ballots remove an immigrant's motivation to learn the English language;

b) bilingual ballots work against integration of the foreign-born into the wider community;

c) Chinese and Hispanic-Americans do not wish to learn English, preferring instead to resist assimilation;

d) bilingual ballots falsely imply that a full economic, social and political life can be achieved in the United States without competence in English;

e) earlier immigrants who learned English represent special treatment for current immigrants;

f) although federal law requires a fifth grade level of English to become a naturalized citizen, state and local propositions are often written "in such complex language that they confuse even native-born English-speaking college graduates."

g) bilingual ballots are useful to new American citizens, particularly the elderly, whose English is strong enough to pass citizenship tests but who feel the ballot choices facing them deserve careful study in the language they know best.

f) bilingual ballots are costly (the Registrar of Voters estimates bilingual voting costs \$25,000 to \$50,000 per election);

g) voters who have limited knowledge of English cannot understand the issues and, therefore would not be informed voters;

h) bilingual ballots are unnecessary since U. S. citizenship requires passing a test for literacy and proficiency in English; and

i) the nation needs to be unified by a common language. (Loo, 1985)

In California one of the most hostile attacks has been made on the Chinese community in regard to the bilingual ballot issue. In the San Francisco Chronicle of 2/11/79, the columnist Herb Cain asked: "Why are the proud, intelligent Chinese so bent on ethnic speaking aids in the voting booth? Obviously the Chinese can learn English. Is the message that they shouldn't be asked to or that they can't be bothered?" He tries to show that they lack motivation to learn English or that not learning it is due to their ethnocentricity.

One important reason that bilingual education programs, multilingual social services, and multilingual voting procedures are often looked at with suspicion can be attributed to the fact that beliefs about the unwillingness or inability of Hispanics to learn English have not been successfully refuted. There is also little factual information available about the need for language assistance. There has been little study of the language and acculturation issues underlying the bilingual ballot debate. This has not been done in spite of the fact that Congress justified bilingual ballot requirements on the basis of educational disadvantage, racial disparities in proportions registered to vote and past discrimination like constructing barriers obstructing equal opportunity for political participation.

The study conducted by Chalsa M. Loo tried to rectify the lack of research on the bilingual ballot issue by testing the assumptions that immigrants are unwilling to acquire American customs and ways and often choose not to adjust; that they are unaware that English language acquisition is the key to socio-economic mobility and that the acquisition of the English language should not be difficult for immigrants. The second aim of her study was to determine if legitimate rationale exist for assistance to certain language minorities. Some persons have argued that "biliterate" (where an individual can read and write in two languages) provisions are discriminating since "no

equal right is afforded other language minorities" such as to Italians, Greeks, Jews, Russians, French, Germans, and Poles. The intent of the study was to determine whether factors related to rate of language shift justified assistance to particular language minorities more than others.

It was found that Chinese immigrants do not resist American cultural values in favor of their native culture. The data went on to show that certain perceived by the Chinese Anglo-American traits such as courtesy, politeness, honesty, openmindedness and friendliness were indeed worthy of acquiring. While other traits such as disrespect to parents and elders, over-permissiveness with children and the ease of divorce were criticized. Certain Chinese traits such as introversion, narrow-mindedness, inability to enjoy life, selfishness and indulgence to gossip merited dropping according to Loo's study.

Two-thirds of the immigrants believed an immigrant should make some cultural changes and half of the immigrants had done so. These cultural shifts included American attire, personality changes toward greater independence, friendliness, and less conservatism as well as greater independence for children in child rearing and American food and eating habits.

Data failed to support the claim that immigrants are uninformed that English is necessary for socio-political participation. Nine out of every ten employed Chinese who had difficulty with the English language knew that English-

speaking ability affected social economic mobility. Eighty-nine percent said that they would feel qualified for a better job if they could speak English well. In addition, there was widespread awareness that non-English language facility affects job status and ease of life functioning. The immigrants were also aware that non-English language facility restricts their geographical mobility, a factor related to socio-economic mobility. When asked if they could speak English well would they stay in their present job or not, seventy-five percent said they would want another job. It is difficulties inherent in successive language acquisition and occupational segregation discrimination that deters English language acquisition for the Chinese immigrant. (Loo, 1985)

Some interesting constructs were discussed in the Loo research concerning difficulties of successive language acquisition. In successive acquisition, where English is learned as a second language under stress as a consequence of immigration, dominance of the native language makes certain linguistic constructs harder to internalize. (Grosjean, 1982) This theory is shown by giving the example of finding oneself in a new linguistic sea which causes some individuals to not feel as free to learn a second language by becoming even more insular. The stronger language interferes with the weaker one, thereby retarding differentiation. In addition, psychological and emotional conflicts resulting from

second language acquisition compound the problem for immigrants. Adult immigrants become like children again being dependent on others for communication of their needs. Second language acquisition can produce identity change with resultant loss in self-esteem or emotional stability. Bilingual persons often have unequally developed skills in the newly acquired language. Facility in oral comprehension exceeds speaking ability which in turn exceeds reading and then writing skill.

Low competence in reading English does not imply that an immigrant is unwilling to learn English nor that the immigrant is non-English speaking. Since reading competency is the most difficult of the four language skills, literate assistance in election provisions targets the greatest point of difficulty. The issue is not bilingual assistance in the voting booth but "biliterate" assistance, and the distinction is critical. The acquisition of English as a second language is slower for populations that are highly concentrated geographically. (Veltman, 1983) The Chinese have a pattern of relatively high geographical concentration. Thus their acquisition of a second language is not an easy process. Then it follows that this group has a great deal to gain from the bilingual ballot. Also coupled with the fact that a large number of Chinese arrive as adults.

Evidence suggests that, with the exception of elderly and invaded populations, the majority of immigrants

want to adjust. When the surrounding society excludes and rejects them through the form of economic, occupational, cultural and social isolation or segregation of immigrants from the majority society takes place, then these factors prevent them from participating in their new country's mainstream and the consequence is less opportunity to learn the new language. While adjustment of one immigrant group might be slower than that of another, factors related to discriminatory rejection by the dominant society are often the cause.

Another factor in the socio-economic category that may affect the lack of incentive to learn English as a second language may be due to the perception that there are no economic or cultural incentives for Hispanic-Americans in border communities to learn English in that the better prepared English-speaking persons of Spanish language background are not receiving rewards that correspond to their educational attainment, equivalent to those obtained by the white English language group. (Loo, 1985) Adjustment of one immigrant group might be slower than that of another but factors related to discriminatory rejection by the dominant society are often the cause. Employment in the ethnic labor market greatly deters English language acquisition because there is no incentive or need to use English in the workplace and because mobility out of the ethnic labor market is so difficult. It has been found that the effect of English-language ability on mobility was not shown to be so great as expected and that

it is the structure of the labor market and not just language that restricts Chinese immigrants to the ethnic labor market. Employees in the ethnic labor market are less aware of discrimination against their race than those who do not work in the ethnic labor market. The more acculturated perceive discrimination more.

In summary since English-only advocates have assumed that immigrants are often unwilling to acquire American customs and ways and are unaware that English language acquisition can lead to socio-economic mobility, this study found no empirical support for these assumptions. Compared to European immigrants, the Spanish-speaking and Asian have greater need for "biliterate" ballots due to their greater number and proportion of recent immigrants. Additional need for language assistance in the electoral process can be justified on the grounds of a lag of biliterate skills behind bilingual skills. Because reading and writing competence normally fall behind speaking and receptive language comprehension skills, immigrants not yet fully literate in the language need the bilingual ballot. It would be more appropriate to rename the bilingual ballot the biliterate ballot because of the more accurate designation of the latter term.

What's Behind the English Language Amendment?

There are five bills to amend the U. S. Constitution before the U. S. Congress to designate English as the official language of the United States. Seventeen states have adopted the English Language Amendment in their state constitutions and it is pending in nearly every other state of the union. Where has this great "popular" upsurge been generated? One of the goals is to severely curtail bilingual education programs which in effect will deny language minority persons and their children access to both programs and future success that is the goal of those programs. A second and third related goal of the supporters of U. S. English is to eliminate the bilingual ballot and in some extreme cases, eliminate or at least curtail the use of translators in social agencies and the courts which will in effect deny language minority persons equal protection under the law.

As to rebutting the adherents of U. S. English's attack on bilingual education, the General Accounting Office has reported to the Congress that, contrary to the claims of the Department of Education, the bulk of evidence supports "the bilingual education law's requirement of the use of native language to the extent necessary to reach the objective of learning English." (General Accounting Office, 1987) It has been shown that first language instruction of students with a low level of literacy in

their first language facilitates their acquisition of English literacy by developing the cognitive abilities necessary to literacy in any language. (Lesnick, 1988)

Professional organizations such as the National Association of Bilingual Education have a more accurate understanding of the research than the U. S. Department of Education seems to and certainly more than the followers of the English Language Amendment do. In fact every major professional organization concerned with language and language learning has formally taken action to oppose the English Language Amendment. All feel that passage of the English Language Amendment will have serious damaging consequences for the education of students with limited English proficiency.

After the passage of Proposition 63 in November, 1987, which made English the Official Language in the state of California, representatives of U. S. English notified the Registrar of Voters in Los Angeles County that ballots and voting materials in any language other than English violate the California State Constitution as amended by Proposition 63. Elimination of the bilingual ballot and the subsequent denial of the effective exercise of the right to vote would seem to violate the Federal Constitution in the same way that the poll tax and literacy tests did. The Fourteenth Amendment seeks to ensure that the right to vote will in no way be abridged "except for participation in rebellion or other crime." U. S. English has, in addition,

challenged the protections of the First Amendment in its petition to the Federal Communications Commission to ban Spanish language radio in South Texas.

In defence of its actions U. S. English denies opponents' charges that the amendment would eliminate services like bilingual 911 operators and court translators and assures the public that the law will not eliminate these services (New York Times, August 2, 1987). However, the fact that attempts have been made to change the law points to a contrary conclusion. Should the amendment be adopted, a new constitutional basis for the interpretation of the legal status of existing services and protections provided to language minorities would be established and could bring about legal challenges of all governmentally sanctioned activity using a language other than English. To cite a present example of the dangers involved, California's English Language Amendment explicitly invites litigation against existing bilingual programs by granting residents the right to challenge any law that "diminishes or ignores the role of English as the common language."

What deeply disturbs opponents of the English as the Official Language is what they believe the amendment is not. To the advocates of the amendment, there is the hope that the unsuspecting assume it is a simple, patriotic affirmation of the place of English in U. S. society, nor is it, as its proponents argue, a prod to encourage non-

English speakers to learn English and achieve assimilation into the social mainstream. Everyone already knows that English is the language in which the affairs of this society are conducted. Everyone already understands that proficiency in English is required for access to the social and economic opportunity desired by all. Opponents believe that hidden behind the seemingly simple intent of the English-only legislation is a program of far reaching implications, which would undermine constitutionally guaranteed rights. Rather than promote assimilation, they fear that the amendment can only further polarize American society. They see that curtailment of already inadequately supported educational programs and the attack on basic rights of language minority citizens and immigrants can only deepen their alienation from the social mainstream.

In the view of many fearful of the hidden agenda at work in the U. S. English movement is that the stated goals of this movement are diametrically different from its obvious, inevitable results. A primary, though unstated goal of U. S. English and its allies, is the creation of a less hospitable environment to discourage the flow of immigrants from Central and South America, Mexico, and the Caribbean as well as all immigration. One critic stated that an official in the Department of Education warned in a publication of the Council on Inter-American Security that bilingual education was part of a strategy adapted by

Hispanic leaders to facilitate terrorists' crossing into the United States to commit acts which would lead to the establishment of an Hispanic nation within the United States. (Butler, 1985)

Another link to the expression of anti-immigrant sentiment with the support for the English Language Amendment program is the fact that the founder and first chairman of U. S. English as previously mentioned was also the founder and chairman of the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR). This organization favors a highly restrictive immigration policy and has lobbied vigorously against the recent immigration law's provision for granting amnesty to undocumented immigrants in the United States since 1982 (National Journal, May 17, 1986). The common ground that unites these two groups is that the promise of a more integrated society has greater appeal than to openly support anti-immigration.

Although the hope had been that since the proposed constitutional amendment is felt to be predicated on the denial of traditional democratic values and rights, that this would be recognized and the consequences of its passage would give rise to growing opposition to its becoming the law of the land. The actual facts show otherwise by the growing number of states' voters passing English-only amendments. Despite the official opposition of such prestigious groups as the American Civil Liberties Union, the Harvard Law Review, the American Jewish

Committee, the National Council of Teachers of English, the International Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, the Linguistic Society of America, the Modern Language Association, the Education Committee of the New York State Assembly, the Council of College Presidents of the City University of New York, the English-only movement is gaining adherents and strength. The social program implicit in the English Language Amendment and its goal to make it an amendment to the U. S. Constitution threatens the most essential protections of the Constitution. It might prove useful to hear the resolutions against the English Language Amendment of the following organizations:

Modern Language Association

MLA Resolution No. 4

Whereas several states have recently passed measures making English their "official language," and

Whereas the "English-only" movement has begun to campaign for the passage of similar measures in other states and has declared its intention to attach an official language amendment to the U. S. Constitution, and

Whereas such measures have the effect of preventing the legislature and state agencies and officials from providing services or information in languages other than English, and

Whereas it is to the economic and cultural advantage of the nation as a whole that its citizens should be proficient in more than one language,

Be it therefore resolved that the Modern Language Association make known its opposition to such "English-only" measures and that it encourage both foreign language study for native English speakers and programs that enable speakers with other linguistic backgrounds to maintain proficiency in those languages along with English. (1985)

National Council of Teachers of English 1986 Resolutions texts

Background: The proposers of this resolution voiced concern about the current movement in some states to establish English as the official language. Such efforts, successful in one instance so far, can include removal of the native languages of many Americans from official documents, they noted, and called such actions potentially discriminatory.

The proposers commended the recent Public Broadcasting System TV series "The Story of English" for illustrating the capacity of English to accommodate and incorporate the linguistic characteristics of many peoples and cultures.

Resolved that the National Council of Teachers of English condemn any attempts to render invisible the native languages of any Americans or to deprive English of the rich influences of the languages and cultures of any of the peoples of America;

that NCTE urge legislators, other public officials, and citizens to oppose actively action intended to mandate or declare English as an official language or to "preserve," "purify," or "enhance" the language. Any such action will not only stunt the vitality of the language, but also ensure its erosion and in effect create hostility toward English, making it more difficult to teach and learn; and

that NCTE widely publish this resolution to its affiliated and other professional organizations through news releases, letters to legislators, boards of education and other state officials, especially in those states attempting to legislate English as an official language.

Approved at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America in December, 1986:

Whereas several states have recently passed measures making English their "official language," and

Whereas the "English-only" movement has begun to campaign for the passage of similar measures in other states and has declared its intention to attach an official language amendment to the U. S. Constitution, and

Whereas such measures have the effect of preventing the legislature and state agencies and officials from providing services or information in languages other than English,

Be it therefore resolved that the Society make known its opposition to such "English-only" measures, on the grounds that they are based on misconceptions about the role of common language in establishing political unity, and that they are inconsistent with basic American ideals of linguistic tolerance. As scholars with a professional interest in language, we affirm that:

The English language in America is not threatened. All evidence suggests that recent immigrants are overwhelmingly aware of the social and economic advantages of becoming proficient in English, and require no additional compulsion to learn the language.

American unity has never rested primarily on unity of language, but rather on common political and social ideals.

History shows that attempts to impose a common language by force of law usually create divisiveness and disunity.

It is to the economic and cultural advantage of the nation as a whole that its citizens should be proficient in more than one language, and to this end we should encourage both foreign language study for native English speakers, and programs that enable speakers with other linguistic backgrounds to maintain proficiency in those languages along with English.

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

March 16, 1987

Dear U.S. Affiliate President:

A number of states, most notably California, have passed laws to declare English their official language. Currently the United States Congress and additional state legislatures are considering similar "English as

official language/English only" measures.

The "English as official language/English only" issue has been of particular concern to many TESOL members, especially in states where "English as Official language/English only" bills have been introduced. In these states, TESOL affiliates are debating the issue and some may be asked to testify and take a position on proposed legislation.

Several affiliates have contacted TESOL to ask for background information and to learn TESOL's official position. For this reason, we are writing to brief you on what TESOL is doing to respond to the "English as official language/English only" debate.

First, we, the Officers and Executive Director of TESOL, want you to know that we are strongly opposed to any action to declare English the official language on the federal, state or local level in the United States. If your state legislature is currently considering this issue or will be introducing "English as official language/English only" legislation within the next month or two, we want TESOL's executive position to be known.

We also want you to know that TESOL considers this issue to be critically relevant to our profession. Of all the professional organizations that may voice an opinion on the issue, TESOL, with 11,000 members involved in teaching English to speakers of other languages throughout the world, is one of several organizations that has the broad, collective experience needed to analyze the issue and to make an informed response.

The "English as the official language/English only" issue will be discussed at the 1987 TESOL Convention in Miami Beach where a resolution opposing such measures will be introduced and voted upon. However, because we know the immediacy of many of your situations, we want to outline the principal arguments of the draft resolution to be presented in Miami Beach for action.

The draft resolution states that TESOL opposes "English as official language/English only" measures for the following reasons:

1. "English as official language/English only" measures are based on the assumption that those who are not proficient in English need an official impetus to compel them to learn English.

As professionals who administer and teach in ESOL programs, we know that this is not the case. No one is more aware of the social and economic advantages of knowing English in the United States than the students who attend our classes.

Even more telling are those limited-English proficient individuals who desperately want to learn English but who cannot attend classes because there are not enough ESL programs to serve them. At this time, there are long waiting lists of people who want to enroll in ESL classes in metropolitan areas throughout the country. The implication that these adults do not want to learn English does a great disservice to them since they know the value of English, are highly motivated and, when given the opportunity to attend ESL classes, are enthusiastic learners.

2. There is a critical shortage of funding on the federal, state and local levels to meet the demand for English as a second language instruction. The time and effort currently spent on the "English as official language/English only" issue would be better used to draft and support legislation to make more funds available for ESL instruction at all educational levels. We object to the fact that these measures require individuals to use English but that they do not provide such individuals with the means to become proficient in it.
3. "English as official language/English only" measures are restrictive in nature and may have the effect of preventing legislatures and state and local agencies from providing critical information and services in languages other than English. These services include voting information and ballots, emergency fire and accident assistance, and approaches to education.
4. History shows that attempts to impose a common language by force of law usually create divisiveness and disunity. We are concerned that "English as official language/English only" measures in the United States will create an atmosphere of ill will and antagonism that will severely hinder rather than foster the acculturation of individuals for whom English is a second language.
5. The history of the United States also shows

that unity in this country has never rested on unity of language, but rather on common political and social ideals. Those individuals who speak a language other than English and who come to the United States as immigrants and refugees have done so precisely because they believe in those common political and social ideals.

6. Measures to declare English as the official language have generated, either intentionally or unintentionally, a negative and narrow view of the position of the United States in the world community. It is to the cultural and economic advantage of the United States that its citizens be proficient in more than one language.

For this reason, we in TESOL encourage programs that provide speakers of other languages--the students we serve--the opportunity to learn English while maintaining their native tongues as well as programs of foreign language study for native English speakers. Rather than "English only," we support an "English PLUS" position: one in which all citizens have the opportunity to learn and use English in addition to another language.

These, then, are the basic reasons for our position against any measure which tries to make English the official language or only language in the United States.

Even though many Americans believe that English is the official language of the United States, it isn't. The Founding Fathers evidently believed that a shared political philosophy was more important than linguistic unity. Nativist sentiment has been inflamed and unease has been triggered among ethnic minorities. U. S. English is also trying to tighten language proficiency standards for prospective citizens. The board of directors of U. S. English has attracted illustrious supporters. These include Saul Bellow, the novelist, the child psychologist

Bruno Bettelheim and the Nobel Prize winning physicist Rosalyn Yalow. Several on the board were immigrants themselves which may partly account for their passionate feelings on the issue. The Austrian born Bettelheim has stated: "All efforts to foster the native language only postpone becoming Americanized, so it's harmful--especially to the children."

Critics of U. S. English say the movement is a backlash against America's newest immigrants--Asians and, especially Hispanics. "It's a real cover for bigotry," says Frederick Erickson, a socio-linguist at the University of Pennsylvania. "It's easier to say we're afraid of English being over-whelmed than to say we don't want any more spics around here." In the fall of 1988, a serious slip revealing this hostility and prejudice of the founder of U. S. English, and its chairman Dr. John Tanton was made, which forced him to quit the organization after his opponents got hold of an inflammatory internal memo he had written on issues including the high birth and immigration rates among Hispanics. He stated in part: "Perhaps this is the first instance in which those with their pants up are going to get caught by those with their pants down."

In a sense the debate over official English is not about language but national identity. U. S. English supporters contend that recent newcomers--particularly Hispanics--do not want to enter the American mainstream.

Not so say their opponents. They believe the issue is how acculturation should proceed. "The argument is not over English as a common language," says Rich Castro, director of the Mayor's Office of Human Rights and Community Relations in Denver. "It's the meanspiritedness of the idea of needing such an amendment that we disagree with." In the end, that could prove more divisive than the use of different languages. The English-only movement "sends a message that non-English speakers cannot be trusted to become American like their ancestors did, and their assimilation must be imposed by statute," says Geoffrey Nunberg, a professor of linguistics at Stanford University. (Salholz, 1989)

To show how the English-only movement can be divisive, one need only look at the recent situation in Suffolk County on Long Island in New York State. A proposal to make English the official language of Suffolk County has started a bitter debate over the rights of the county's foreign-speaking residents.

Under the provisions of the bill, which if approved will be subject to a referendum in November, 1989 would require that most county business, brochures, and pamphlets be solely in English. Any private agency contracting with Suffolk County would be required to conduct county business in English.

The backers of the bill believe it will speed the assimilation of immigrants into American society as well

as curb a growing number of bilingual programs in county government. Critics of the bill, including many Hispanic leaders say the bill is racist and will prevent the county from delivering essential health and social services to residents who have not yet mastered English. Suffolk County has the state's largest number of Hispanic residents outside New York City, 100,000 out of 1.4 million residents. (Schmitt, 1989)

"The legislation is divisive and unnecessary," said County Executive Patrick G. Halpin, who has vowed to veto the measure if it is approved by the eighteen member County Legislature. More than 100 local and national supporters and opponents of the bill testified in the first of two hearings held on the measure. Legislators have received more mail and phone calls on the bill than any other issue in the last ten years. It seems that wherever the Official English movement arises there is always a groundswell of divisive debate.

Where this bill differs from the seventeen state laws already passed, which for the most part are simple statements reaffirming the importance of English as the common language, is that the Suffolk bill would block the creation of bilingual county jobs and bars the County Human Rights Commission from investigating complaints stemming from the county's conducting its business in English. Just court interpreters, police officers, ambulance dispatchers and other safety officials would be exempt. Election ballots

and federal and state programs like food stamps will not be covered because they are protected by higher legislation.

Opponents say that for all practical purposes, English is already the official language in Suffolk County. The chairman of the Human Rights Agency, Adrian Cabral, said: "If you're going to make it, sooner or later you have to learn to speak English. But people need to be helped during that transition."

The bill would prohibit social workers, child-abuse investigators, consumer protection advocates, and doctors in county clinics from speaking to clients in Spanish or any other foreign language. The county, at present, has fifty-three government jobs that require fluency in Spanish and English.

"They could bring interpreters," the principal sponsor of the bill, Joseph Rizzo, Republican of Islip Terrace, said. "This bill brings people together. The quicker people learn to speak English, the better it is for them and for the country."

Some critics feel the bill is racist while others contend that it was born of ignorance. "Do they think that because we speak another language, we're going to take over?" asked Shirley Rodriguez Remenski, executive director of the Governor's Office for Hispanic Affairs. "This could set a disastrous precedent for other counties."

Even some national advocates for English as the official language have distanced themselves from the Suffolk proposal. "It's counter-productive," said

Steve Workings, director of policy development for U. S. English. Mr. Workings has criticized the provision that would bar investigations of human rights abuses resulting from the law.

As nearly always occurs when the electorate are polled on this issue, Suffolk residents have overwhelmingly embraced the proposal. In a poll of 1,400 constituents, Legislator Michael O'Donohoe, Conservative of East Northport, said eighty-four percent supported the bill. "By catering to foreign languages, the people who come to this country have no incentive to learn English quickly," said Mr. O'Donohoe, a sponsor of the bill.

The tone of public opinion has worried many opponents. "The issue is being wrapped around the flag, so that anyone who doesn't support the bill is un-American," said Joseph S. Fenollol, vice-chairman of La Union Hispanica, an agency in Central Islip that conducts nutrition programs principally for Spanish-speaking clients.

"The letters I get are really redneck," said Frank R. Jones, the Supervisor of Islip Township, which has several thousand residents from Colombia, Puerto Rico, El Salvador and the Dominican Republic. "They say, 'If they can't speak English, they should go back to where they came from.'"

Many elected officials and civic leaders fear the debate may have caused permanent damage. "This has sent out a real negative message to minority groups in the county," said

legislator George Nolan, Democrat of Islip, who opposes the bill. "That bad feeling is going to linger long after this bill is forgotten." The above situation is a prime example of the negativism and social rendering that the English-only movement can generate.

The impact of passage of the English Language Amendment on education would in effect be to curtail severely language rights in the precedent set since Meyer v. Nebraska. Interpretations of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 would be affected as well. Under the restrictive wording of section 3 of the amendment, the required use by public school administrators of educational techniques for other purposes--such as to foster fluency by English speaking and non-English speaking children in more than one language or to familiarize ethnic minority children with their history or culture--currently permitted by state and federal law, might be prohibited. Public institutions of higher education requiring command of or proficiency in a foreign language as a prerequisite for degrees would no longer be able to make such requirements, a result that would radically alter foreign language departments and arts and graduate degrees requiring foreign languages as research skills. Secondary schools that require foreign language credits would also be prohibited from making such demands for graduation. Foreign language instruction would not be done at tax-payer expense,

radically curtailing public school language programs and personnel.

There may also be a hidden trap in section 4, where very real ambiguities arise. For example, could Congress or any state enforce section 1 by making it illegal to speak other than English in public places? Such a possibility is not fully protected by the Fourteenth Amendment rights. It is legally possible for such an infringement of private, personal language rights to happen. The possibility, if not the probability, does exist for such curtailing of individual rights.

Most importantly by passage of the English Language Amendment, the impact upon society would arouse a great deal of anger among American citizens, including many English monolinguals. Foreign language teachers as well as all bilinguals would find themselves discriminated against. When the problems of racial prejudice, isolation, ghettoization, and other forms of social and economic discrimination against the non-assimilated minorities in America have the loss of language rights added as well, reactions leading to civil unrest and possible violence could occur.

The second Senate version of the English Language Amendment was proposed on September 21, 1983, as Senate Joint Resolution 167, sponsored by Senator Huddleston (KY.) and co-sponsored by Senators Burdick, Symms, Randolph, and Zorinsky. The reasons given for this legislation by its

various sponsors offer interesting insights into the reactions that the growth of language rights have caused in some corners of the English-speaking electorate.

Huddleston argued that the English Language Amendment was necessary to interpret his remarks to his colleagues. The English Language Amendment would "guarantee that this current state of affairs endures, as it has for over 200 years." Huddleston went on to say, "Almost alone among the world's very large and populous nations, the United States enjoys the blessings of one primary language, spoken and understood by most of its citizens." His statement effectively does away with Hayakawa's argument that national unity is gained primarily through the common use of a language, for if Huddleston's comment is correct, other nations are either not experiencing senses of unity or they are not united, both of which seem dubious propositions.

Huddleston went on to state that "for the past fifteen years, we have experienced a growing resistance to the acceptance of our historic language, an antagonistic questioning of the melting pot philosophy that has traditionally helped speed newcomers into the American mainstream," and now, in spite of easing immigration language requirements and legislating bilingual education programs, "The demands have sharply escalated, and so has the tone in which they are presented." He implied that

bilingual education had moved from a transitional to a maintenance philosophy, "primarily shaped and promoted by the Federal Government," yielding the result that "thousands of immigrant and non-immigrant children are languishing in near permanent bilingual/bicultural programs, kept in a state of prolonged confusion suspended between two worlds, and not understanding what is expected of them," they and their parents have been "given false hopes that their cultural traditions can be fully maintained in this country."

Huddleston then goes on to quote from Theodore H. White's America in Search of Itself, which was cited earlier. Each of the language situations leading to violence that White cited (Canada, France, India) came about because of some denial of language rights by a province or nation, the very thing the English Language Amendment would also do. There is no one-to-one relationship between language and national unity, for a nation can be divided when it has only one language (the English Civil War and Interregnum, the American Civil War, the Spanish Civil War, Northern Ireland, Lebanon) and united when it has as many as four official languages (Switzerland, for example). Nor is there any relationship between minority language rights, but majority rights for French speakers. Finally, when linguistic rights were guaranteed, as well as improvements made in the social, economic, and political status of French Canadians within and outside of Quebec, talk of secession seemed to abate.

The truth is that claims that political disunity within Canada would lead to open rebellion never materialized.

The assumption that people are not learning English because of certain governmental policies and statutes to allow other languages but would do so if such regulations were abolished is not substantiated. There is no information to show that previous generations were any more successful at mastering English than those who arrived after the adoption of such policies. Will abolition of these statutes result in the mastery of English? These assumptions are unproven at best and dubious at worst.

The evidence on bilingual education is inconclusive. There are no studies which demonstrate definitively that bilingual education is a failure in terms of better English language mastery, nor are there studies that show that monolingual programs lead to better mastery of English than bilingual programs. The charges against bilingual education may create negative reactions against those who support and attend them. No definitive studies show the effectiveness of maintenance versus transitional bilingual education programs nor that subject-area material taught in the student's native language impedes English language acquisition.

As for the bilingual ballot accusations, there is no substantial proof being offered that bloc-voting, which is no new phenomenon in the United States, nor that the issues presented through non-English media are less detailed and

accurate than those covered by the English media.

The provisions accorded non-English speakers in the last two decades--bilingual education, court translators, bilingual ballots, bilingual health workers, and so on, were designed to place these groups on an equal footing with those who are fluent in English. By abolishing these provisions, dissatisfaction among a segment of the population because they feel they are not being accorded equal treatment under the law, could occur.

The English Language Amendment has political ramifications far beyond the wording of the Senate and House joint resolutions. For Example, U. S. English has provoked a political response which is counter to the earliest American intellectual traditions: that of the tolerance of, and the respect for, individual rights. Two assumptions seem to characterize the political outlook of U. S. English: (1) divisive conflicts are inevitable in societies which are not culturally homogeneous, and (2) a dominant group from the majority culture must maintain rigorous political control in order to insure societal stability. The professed desire of U. S. English to unify American society through establishing an official language in the United States could in fact have just the opposite effect. In giving the language practices of the majority constitutional sanction, they would withdraw rights built up slowly and arduously by the minorities.

The wording of the five English Language Amendments

proposed has been their weak point. Hayakawa made certain assurances that sections of the joint resolutions contradict. For example, the signs he feels necessary for public safety would not be posted in other languages under the House resolution. How government funds could be used for foreign-language instruction that does not have a 'transitional method' for teaching English as its goal, is not evident. Foreign-language departments in state supported institutions would have been in violation of the Constitution had Senate Joint Resolution 72 been passed. Public institutions of higher education requiring command of or proficiency in a foreign language as a prerequisite for degrees would no longer be able to make such rules, a result that would radically alter foreign language departments and arts and graduate degrees requiring other languages as research skills. Secondary schools which require foreign languages for credit would also be prohibited from making such demands for graduation. Foreign language instruction would not be done at taxpayer expense, radically curtailing public school language programs and personnel.

A variety of arguments can be used to counter the statements written into the Congressional Record by the various introducers of English Language Amendments. One might wonder why, since the pendulum has swung back to the appreciation of foreign languages in American education and society, has the English Language Amendment been proposed.

Why a constitutional amendment? Could not Congress just pass a law, and that would have the same effect? The answer is probably no for there now exists a precedent in Supreme Court and other federal court cases, a legislative precedent in the voting rights, civil rights, and bilingual education acts, that nothing short of a constitutional amendment would be capable of overturning the precedent in law. Only by changing the Constitution itself, the most radical form of legislation, does it seem possible to reverse again the rise of language rights.

Congressman Norman D. Shumway introduced House Joint Resolution 169 and gave the following reasons for proposing the English Language Amendment. (1) Linguistic minority groups must learn English if they are to become fully integrated into American society; (2) official policies, such as those which recognize other languages as the accepted language of the ballot box, may actually impede the learning of English; (3) the federal government was 'sending conflicting signals to the non-English speaking people in America.'

Shumway stated that "our nation is experiencing the largest influx of immigrants in its history" and that because of this fact, "we must not promote the segregation of the Nation's immigrants by legislating bilingual programs which enhance the dissimilarities between immigrants and the mainstream of American life." He then had

read into the Congressional Record an article in The Christian Science Monitor by Gerda Bikales, then executive director of U. S. English, which was a personal remembrance of her assimilation and ease in learning English. Since it was her fourth language, it is not surprising it was learned with ease. The article also attacked bilingual education. On July 21, 1983, Shumway reiterated his contention that immigration was at an all time high in United States history and noted the 1974 Supreme Court decision Lau v. Nichols where the Court cited Health, Education, and Welfare guidelines on bilingual education, guidelines that were "never laws or even Federal regulations (see, however, the Education Code of the United States, Sec. 1708). 'He argued for local school districts having the option "to decide which programs best meet the unique needs and circumstances of their students." This was later adopted by Secretary Bennet under the Reagan administration. Shumway later had read into the Congressional Record an article in the Washington Times by Robert Rossier entitled "Bilingual Education: the New Latin Hustle" which claimed that "bilingual education retards the learning of English because it provides less time for interaction in the language and because it inhibits student responses in English." His article went on to state that "the modern immigrant has been betrayed by a confederation of power seeking politicians, unprincipled educators, unwitting Americans." (Marshall, 1986)

Shumway again attacked bilingual education programs on April 12, 1984, when he noted that the English Language Amendment, "while it would not eliminate the use of bilingual education, would place emphasis in its use as a transitional method and encourage the broader range of instruction." Shumway did not delineate what the broader range of instruction would be. He then read into the Congressional Record a newspaper article from McAllen, Texas titled "Parents" whose disenchantment with bilingual education was on the rise. The article highlighted one immersion class, but one very experimental. In the article, the administrator of the program noted the probability that the experimental class was experiencing the 'Hawthorne effect' where the new and novel are the variables which account for a program's success.

To rebut Shumway is not hard to do. First, current waves of immigration are not the highest in our nation's history. On the contrary, that crest came between 1900 and 1910. There seemed to be no dangerous fragmenting of the nation then, nor were those immigrants kept out of the mainstream of American life. Shumway's arguments are just not factual. Second, although he stated that there are no studies proving conclusively that bilingual education does work, such studies do exist in abundance and do indicate that bilingual education does have demonstrable value. Local option for bilingual education has turned back the clock to the same situation that existed and

necessitated Lau v. Nichols and many more recent cases. Few citizens who are discriminated against end up having the financial means for suing to regain their rights. (Marshall, 1986)

There are other instances where federal law mandates foreign languages; for example, interpreters must be used in physical and mental examinations of aliens seeking entry into the United States. Federal courts also provide interpreters in civil and criminal proceedings for those whose primary language is not English. Serving process papers by U. S. and state courts on foreign states or their subdivisions with translations into the foreign language of the foreign state is provided by federal statute. Foreign language speaking personnel are provided in federally funded migrant and community health centers, and in alcohol abuse and treatment programs. The probable effect of the proposed English Language Amendment would be nullification of these and related federal laws to the extent they require, and not simply permit, the use of a foreign language.

The socio-political discontent of the 1960's and 1970's indicates that often times separatist movements and/or civil unrest are provoked by sentiments of rejection based on non-participation and lack of recognition.

After the English Language Amendment with its current language intact would be ratified, laws prohibiting the use of languages other than English in matters relating to public safety and health, disallowing languages other than

English in public meetings, and banning any other type on non-English language use could be passed. Some of the above laws could be challenged under the First Amendment to the Constitution. In the ensuing adjudications ending with the Supreme Court, the English Language Amendment could open a Pandora's box and lead to restrictions of civil rights and individual liberties which many might view as contrary to American values. By not passing the English Language Amendment, provisions of the First Amendment will take precedence over any federal, state, or local attempt to impose severe language restrictions on the American people. There is strong proof that the English Language Amendment supporters and lobbyists have presented both incorrect and incomplete information.

It has been questioned why a constitutional amendment is needed. Why not abolish the bilingual ballot provision of the Voting Rights Act or change the Bilingual Education Act to make transitional programs the only possible option and eliminate provisions such as bicultural education? The answer according to some writers (Maldoff and McArthur, 1986) is that there are some other motives behind the English Language Amendment. Most supporters of the English Language Amendment are often from states or districts with small numbers of non-English speakers. The sponsors tend not to be supportive of any type of language or international studies.

The most revealing information is in the ratings on political ideology compiled by Americans for Democratic Action, the liberal rating group, and Americans for Constitutional Action, a conservative rating group. These ratings reveal that most of the English Language Amendment supporters are extremely conservative. (Judd, 1987)

Gerda Bikales, former head of U. S. English expressed her views of the country as follows:

We have changed since the case was made for homogeneity. We are no longer a contiguous Nation, but one spread out far into the Pacific and beyond Canada's north. We no longer share common ancestors, the heroes of American history have been kicked off their pedestals. We speak a multitude of languages and insist on voting in them and on educating our children in them. Religion is no longer a common tie. We have remained steadfast in our beliefs in democratic government, it is true, but the emphasis has shifted entirely to assertions of individual rights, and the individual's obligations to the collective seem all but forgotten. Manners, customs, and lifestyles have never been so varied. The criterion of a common history of war and suffering followed by a happy outcome, so meaningful to the generations that fought the Revolutionary War, means little to Americans who mostly remember unpopular wars with confused outcomes, and finally, far from getting past wrongs, we resurrect every hurt, every past injustice, to every group in American society, and each group makes sure that these are magnified and used to political advantage, rather than forgotten.

Rather than stating that foreigners are undesirable, especially those from Asia and Latin America, a statement that could be called racist, it is safer to state that new arrivals are failing to learn English, being unpatriotic, being uninformed voters and desiring to

maintain their own values.

As to how the English Language Amendment would affect Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, the passage of the English Language Amendment would affect how TESOL teachers teach and the environment in which they teach. ESL would be forced to return to the philosophy of ESL as Americanization in which equal efforts would have to be made trying to assimilate students into American culture as well as to teach the language. Use of students' native languages would be allowed only if it served these Americanization goals.

ESL teachers would be held accountable if their students do not learn English. By implementing the policy, the teachers could become alienated from their students. A choice would have to be made between violation of conscience and violation of job responsibilities. Those teachers outside the United States, although not directly involved, might note how language and politics interact and to be aware of how tenuous the relationship is between education and ideology. (Judd, 1987)

Those who do research should be concerned that often there has been a failure to disseminate the findings of studies to those who make policy. The debate can also point to directions for future research projects since studies are still needed to support or refute English Language Amendment supporters and opponents. Many of the

claims being made are merely hypotheses and need either validation or denial based on fact, not conjecture. The English Language Amendment issues should be a warning to all engaged in research that when studies are available in language policy issues, those individuals in an authoritative position to make decisions often ignore those studies since they already have predisposed ideologies. (Judd, 1987)

The real threat may be the hostilities that evolve from the English Language Amendment debate. Passage of any amendment is a long haul operation. As professionals who deal with people from non-English language backgrounds, those individuals concerned and working in the field of teaching English as a second language should be well informed and actively involved in this issue. Since no one desires political, economic, or social disunity, what is not needed is simplistic reasoning and narrow ideological pronouncements which do not solve the social issues of our time but only generate distrust, hatred, and false charges. What is needed is an informed electorate.

English Language Amendment supporters are often quoted as saying that their motto is one nation...indivisible. They, unfortunately, seem to have forgotten the second part of the quotation, with liberty and justice for all...

Bibliography

- "Administration Drops Bilingual Regs," American Teacher, March 1981, vol. 65, no. 6, pp. 1, 16.
- Alatis, James E. "Comment: the question of language policy," International Journal of the Sociology of Language, vol. 60, 1986, pp. 197-200.
- Alfonso, Mirna. "English-Only Sign Proposal Sidetracked," Los Angeles Times, November 24, 1985, part X, p. 4.
- Alfonso, Mirna. "South Gate Planners to Study Idea: English-only sign bill sidetracked," Los Angeles Times, November 17, 1985, part IX, p. 4.
- Alter, Jonathan and others. "English Spoken Here, Please," Newsweek, January 9, 1984, vol. 103, pp. 24-25.
- Anderson, Kurt. "Final Destination," Time, July 8, 1985, vol. 126, p. 46.
- Anshen, Frank. "Tongues and Myths," New York Times, October 19, 1980, p. E 21.
- Arax, Mark. "Judge Upholds Foes of 'Official English' Vote," Los Angeles Times, December 25, 1985, part II, p. 4.
- Armstrong, Scott. "English Classes Bulging with Immigrants," Christian Science Monitor, March 23, 1987, p. 1.
- Armstrong, Scott. "Should English Have Official-language Stamp?" Christian Science Monitor, July 31, 1986, p. 1.
- "Avoiding Canada's Problem," National Review, October 18, 1985, vol. 37, pp. 62-63.
- Baker, Russell. "Dealing with California," New York Times Magazine, December 7, 1986, p. 36.
- Ballin, Heinz Adolf. "English Only: is it necessary? Speaking a common language is vital to keep Americans united," Los Angeles Times, November 2, 1986, part II, p. 16.
- Bane, Nancy. "Official English: fear or foresight?" America, December 17, 1988, vol. 159, p. 515.
- Barbaro, Kay. "The Cuckoo Nest," Hispanic Link Weekly Report, November 24, 1986, p. 3.

Barker, Karlyn. "D. C. Hispanics Plan to end School Bilingual Unit," Washington Post, November 7, 1988, p. C 2.

Barzun, Jacques. Language & Life: on the necessity of a common tongue. Washington, D. C., U. S. English, 1987.

"Battle Over Bilingualism: opposition intensifies to ads using Spanish," Los Angeles Times, September 2, 1986, part I, p. 21.

Baugh, J. "Linguistic Diversity and Justice in America: growing complexity in a traditional national paradox," Urban Resources, vol. 3, 1985, pp. 31-35.

Beardsmore, Hugo Baetens and Roland Willems. "Comment," International Journal of the Sociology of Language, vol. 60, 1986, pp. 117-128.

Beck, Joan. "America Needs a Common Voice," Chicago Tribune, July 7, 1986, p. I 8.

Beers, David. "'Us' and 'Them': push to make English official goes beyond the issue of language," Los Angeles Daily Journal, July 25, 1986, p. 4.

"Being an American Means Knowing English," New York Times, November 18, 1988, p. A 22.

Bergholz, Richard and Ellen Hume. "Mailing by Hayakawa sent postage-free," Los Angeles Times, January 25, 1983, part I, p. 16.

"Big Vote Against Non-English Ballots," Editorial. San Francisco Chronicle, November 9, 1984, p. 70.

Bikales, Gerda. "Comment: the other side," International Journal of the Sociology of Language, vol. 60, 1986, pp. 77-85.

Bikales, Gerda. "From the Editor's Desk: what can one person do?" Up-date, September-October 1985, p. 7.

Bikales, Gerda and Gary Imhoff. A Kind of Discordant Harmony: issues in assimilation. Washington, D. C., U. S. English, 1985.

Bikales, Gerda. "United States Moving Toward a Bilingual Society?" English Around the World, vol. 22, no. 4, 1983, p. 7.

Bikales, Gerda. "You'd Be a Nobody If They Didn't Make You Learn English," Christian Science Monitor, April 20, 1983, p. 22.

Bilingual Education: a new look at the research evidence (March, 1987) General Accounting Office/PEMD-87-12BR p. 3.

The Bilingual Education Act. Rosslyn, Virginia, National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1979.

- Bilingual Education: questions and answers. Washington, D. C., U. S. English, 1988.
- "Bill Pushes an Official State Prejudice," Editorial. Atlanta Constitution, February 18, 1986, p. 22.
- Billiter, Bill. "Alternatives Offered for Teaching English to Immigrant Child," Los Angeles Times, March 13, 1986, part II, p. 3.
- Billiter, Bill. "Bilingualism: is immersion method best?" Los Angeles Times, April 17, 1986, part II, p. 1.
- Billiter, Bill. "Public Forum Slated On 'English Only' Measure," Los Angeles Times, October 14, 1986, part II, p. 2.
- Billiter, Bill. "Torres Blasts English-Only Initiative," Los Angeles Times, November 7, 1986, part II, p. 5.
- Blair, William G. "New York to Offer Bilingual Programs for more Students," New York Times, January 15, 1989, p. A 18.
- "Bradley Assails 'English Only' Idea as 'Evil'," Los Angeles Times, July 15, 1986, part II, pp. 1-2.
- Brownstorm, Ronald, Richard E. Cohen and Rene T. Riley. "Great Debates: English as the Official Language," National Journal, October 18, 1985, p. 2388.
- Butler, R. E. On Creating a Hispanic America: a nation within a nation? Washington, D. C., Council for Inter American Security, 1985.
- "California Becomes Seventh State to Declare English its Official Language in Landslide Election Victory," Up-date, November-December 1986, p. 1.
- "California Legislature Holds Hearings on English-Only," San Francisco Chronicle, September 30, 1986, p. 8.
- Carlin, David. "Outlawing Tongues," Commonweal, December 5, 1986, pp. 648-649.
- Carlin, David. "Charm and the English Language Amendment," Christian Century, September 19, 1984, pp. 822-823.
- Carlson, Margaret. "Only English Spoken Here," Time, December 5, 1988, vol. 132, p. 29.
- Carmody, Deirdre. "Asians Increasing at U. S. Colleges," New York Times, November 9, 1988, p. B 10.

- Carmody, Deirdre. "Bilingual Education Survives in California," New York Times, December 2, 1987, p. A 20.
- Castro, Ray. "Shifting the Burden of Bilingualism: the case for monolingual communities," The Bilingual Review, vol. 3, January-April, 1976, pp. 3-28.
- Cazden, Courtney B. and David K. Dickinson. "Language in Education: standardization versus cultural pluralism," In Charles A. Ferguson and Shirley Brice Heath, Language in the USA, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Chambers, Marcia. "California Braces for Change with English as Official Language," New York Times, November 26, 1986, p. A 20.
- Chapman, Stephen. "Make English the Official Language," Chicago Tribune, February 22, 1985, p. I 15.
- Chen, Edward M. and Wade Henderson. "New 'English-Only' Movement Reflects Old Fear of Immigrants," Civil Liberties, Summer/Fall 1986, pp. 8-9.
- Church, George J. "The Welcome Wears Thin," Time, vol. 116, September 1, 1980, pp. 8-10.
- Claffey, Charles E. "Say It Again Sam," The Boston Globe, March 19, 1988, pp. 33-34.
- Clines, Francis X. "The Mother Tongue Has a Movement," New York Times, June 3, 1984, p. E 8.
- Cohen, Richard. "English Will Only Get Better," Washington Post, November 5, 1986, p. A 21.
- Conklin, Nancy Faires and Margaret A. Lourie. A Host of Tongues: language communities in the United States, New York, The Free Press, 1983.
- Cooper, Ann. "Immigration Reformer Stirs Melting Pot," National Journal, vol. 18, May 17, 1986, p. 1210.
- Corwin, Miles. "It's Official: in Fillmore, you have to habla ingles," Los Angeles Times, May 6, 1986, part 1, pp. 3, 21.
- Crawford, James. "37 States Consider 'English Only' Bills, With Mixed Results: debates spark animosities in several legislatures," Education Week, vol. 6, no. 38, June 17, 1987, pp. 1, 14.
- Crowdson, John M. "Hispanic Vote Gains as Debate on Rights Act Swirls," New York Times, May 22, 1981, p. A 15.

- Crowell, Michael G. "American Traditions of Language Use: their relevance today," English Journal, vol. 59, January 1970, pp. 109-115.
- Cummins, Jim. "Empowering Minority Students," Harvard Educational Review, vol. 56, February 1986, pp. 18-36.
- Dart, John. "Bishops Oppose English-Only Measure," Los Angeles Times, September 26, 1986, part I, p. 29.
- "The Debate: speaking English," USA Today, May 19, 1988.
- Debate with Gerda Bikales, Executive Director, U. S. English, Philadelphia, May 2, 1987--Text of Opening Remarks by Tony Califa, ACLU.
- "Debates Growing on Use of English: ethnic groups to fight official language plan in California," New York Times, July 21, 1986, pp. A 1, A 8.
- Diesenhouse, Susan. "Broad Bilingual Aid Plan Settles Segregation Suit," New York Times, December 14, 1988, p. B 16.
- Donahue, Thomas S. "U. S. English: its life and works," International Journal of the Sociology of Language, vol. 56, 1985, pp. 99-112.
- "Echoes of nativism: English-language referenda," Editorial. America, vol. 159, December 10, 1988, p. 483.
- "Education Department Approves English-Language Program as Alternative to Bilingual Education," Education Times, January 12, 1981, vol. 1, no. 48, pp. 1, 3.
- "Education Requirement Seen as Snag to Program for Aliens," New York Times, November 7, 1988, p. A 14.
- Ehrlich, Elizabeth. "Should English-Only be the Law of the Land? California ballot initiative making English the official language of state," Business Week, November 10, 1986, p. 116.
- "Encourage English: don't force it," New York Times, November 7, 1988, p. A 18.
- Encyclopedia of Associations. 23rd edition. Detroit, Gale Research, 1988, pp. 712, 1456.
- "Ending the Bilingual Double-Talk," New York Times, August 8, 1980, p. A 28.

- Eng, Lilly. "Monterey Park Struggles to Speak with one Voice on English Issue," Los Angeles Times, November 30, 1986, Part IX, p. 1.
- Eng, Lilly. "Monterey Park Voids Stand for English as Official Language," Los Angeles Times, October 29, 1986, Part IX, p. 35.
- English First Members' Report. Springfield, Virginia, English First, 1988.
- "English Isn't the Only Language We Speak (letters)." Washington Post, August 9, 1986.
- "The English Language: out to conquer the world," U. S. News and World Report, vol. 98, February 18, 1985, pp. 49-52.
- "English-Only Ballots," The San Diego Union, March 25, 1984, p. C 2.
- "English-Only Foes Get Some Legislative Help," Los Angeles Times, August 14, 1986, part I, pp. 3, 36.
- "English-Only Foes to Press Fillmore Fight," Los Angeles Times, March 13, 1986, part II, p. 8.
- "English Proposal Stays on the Florida Ballot," New York Times, November 6, 1988, p. 41.
- "English Spoken Here, but Unofficially," New York Times, October 29, 1988, p. A 28.
- "English Spoken Here, O. K.? A California Crusade to Stamp Out Bilingualism," Time, vol. 128, August 25, 1986, p. 27.
- "English, Yes: Xenophobia, No (editorial)," New York Times, November 10, 1986, p. A 22.
- Enriquez, Sam. "Object to Bilingual Program: Columbus parents ask for English-only classes," Los Angeles Times, November 21, 1986, part IX, p. 1.
- Enriquez, Sam. "Parents Seek English-Only Classes," Los Angeles Times, November 24, 1985, part II, p. 17.
- Fallows, James. "Viva Bilingualism: English has nothing to fear," New Republic, vol. 195, pp. 18-19.
- Ferguson, Charles A. and Shirley Brice Heath. Language in the USA. London, Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Ferguson, Tim W. "The Bilingual Battle," The Wall Street Journal, April 29, 1988, p. 22.

- Field, Mervin. "Most Californians Want Ballots in English Only," San Francisco Chronicle, September 6, 1984, p. 8.
- Fields, Howard. "GAO Supports Bilingual Education," Publishers Weekly, Vol. 231, April 10, 1987, p. 17.
- Frequently Used Arguments Against the Legal Protection of English. Washington, D. C., U. S. English, 1987.
- Front, Rabbi Henri E. "English-Only: is it necessary? Measure Threatens to Divide us and Tarnish our Proud Heritage," Los Angeles Times, November 2, 1986, part II, p. 16.
- Garcia, Robert. "Keep Bilingual Education Flexible," New York Times, September 16, 1983, p. A 28.
- Glazer, Sarah. "Bilingual Education: does it work?" Congressional Quarterly's Editorial Research Reports, Vol. I, March 11, 1988, pp. 126-139.
- Gonzalez, Roseann Duenas, Victoria F. Vasquez and Alice A. Schott. "The English Language Amendment: examining myths," English Journal, vol. 77, March 1988, p. 24-30.
- "Great Debates," National Journal, vol. 18, October 4, 1986, p. 2388.
- Görlach, Manfred. "Comment," International Journal of the Sociology of Language, vol. 60, 1986, pp. 97-103.
- Grosjean, Francois. Life in Two Languages: an introduction to bilingualism. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Hakuta, Kenji. Mirror of Language: the debate on bilingualism. New York, Basic Books, 1986.
- Hayakawa, S. I. "A Common Language, So All Can Pursue Common Goals," Los Angeles Times, October 29, 1986, part II, p. 13.
- Hayakawa, S. I. One Nation ... Indivisible? The English Language Amendment. Washington, D. C., The Washington Institute for Values in Public Policy, 1985.
- Hayakawa, S. I. U. S. English Promotional Letter, 1984.
- Hayakawa, S. I. "Why English Should Be Our Official Language," taken from The Executive Educator. Reprinted in Education Digest, vol. 52, May 1987, pp. 36-37.
- Hayakawa, S. I. "Why the English Language Amendment?" English Journal, vol. 76, December 1987, p. 14-17.

- Heath, Shirley Brice and Lawrence Krasner. "Comment," International Journal of the Sociology of Language, vol. 60, 1986, pp. 157-162.
- Hechinger, Fred M. "A Humane Look at Bilingual Schooling," New York Times, May 31, 1983, p. C 6.
- Heffernan, Nancy. "Bill Introduced to Make English California's Official Language," Los Angeles Times, January 9, 1985, part I, p. 1.
- Henry, William A. "Against a Confusion of Tongues," Time, vol. 121, June 13, 1983, p. 30.
- Herbers, John. "Hispanic Advances Found in Suburbs," New York Times, June 28, 1981, pp. 1, 36.
- Hernandez, Marita. "Abolishment of Bilingual Ballots Sparks Anger," Los Angeles Times, August 9, 1984, part II, p. 3.
- Hill, Gladwin. "Everyday Use of Foreign Languages is Rising in U. S.," New York Times, May 5, 1981, p. C 20.
- Hirsch, Eric Donald. Cultural Literacy: what every American needs to know. New York, Vintage Books, 1988.
- "Hispanic People Attack English-Language Bills," New York Times, August 2, 1987, p. A 32.
- Hockman, Anndee. "Fairfax: 'English and Only English': educators point to test scores as proof of ESL's success," Washington Post, July 9, 1985, sec. I, p. A 8.
- Hughes, John. "English Spoken Here," Christian Science Monitor, August 9, 1986, p. 14.
- "Ideas and Trends: is English the only language for government?" New York Times, October 26, 1986, sec. 4, p. 6.
- In Defense of Our Common Language. Washington, D. C., U. S. English, 1987.
- Ingram, Carl. "Prop. 63 Backers Aim at Bilingual Education," Los Angeles Times, November 24, 1986, p. I 3.
- Irvin, Molly. "Bilingual Education Stirs Colorado Power Struggles," New York Times, March 1, 1980, p. 8.
- Judd, Elliot L. "The English Language Amendment: a case study on language and politics," TESOL Quarterly, vol. 21, March 1987, pp. 113-135.

- Kloss, Heinz. "Comment," International Journal of the Sociology of Language, vol. 60, 1986, pp. 169-176.
- Krebs, Albin. "Amendment Urged to Make English Official Language," New York Times, April 15, 1981, p. 28.
- "Latino, Asian Units Call English-Only Movement 'Un-American'," Los Angeles Times, August 21, 1986, part I, p. 23.
- "Latinos Hit Firms' English Fluency Rule," Los Angeles Times, June 23, 1985, part II, p. 32.
- Lesnick, Henry. "What's Behind the English Language Amendment?" [unpublished] 1988. (Available from: Henry Lesnick, English Department, Hostos Community College, City University of New York, 500 Grand Concourse, Bronx, New York 10451)
- "Let's Say Adios to 'Official' English," Business Week, November 10, 1986, p. 154.
- Liebowicz, Joseph. "The Proposed English Language Amendment--Shield or Sword?" Yale Law and Policy Review, vol. 3, 1985, pp. 519-550.
- Lindsey, Robert. "Debates Growing on Use of English: ethnic groups to fight official language plan in California," New York Times, July 21, 1986, part I, A 1.
- Llorente, Elizabet. "Bilingual Family at Home," New York Times, November 10, 1985, sec. XII, p. 52.
- Llorente, Elizabet. "Linda Chavez: thriving on controversy," The New Mexican Vista, November 8, 1987, pp. 1-2.
- Loo, Chalsa M. "The 'Biliterate' Ballot Controversy: language acquisition and cultural shift among immigrants," International Migration Review, vol. 19, Fall 1985, pp. 493-515.
- McArthur, Tom. "Comment: worried about something else," International Journal of the Sociology of Language, vol. 60, 1986, pp. 87-91.
- McBee, Susanna. "A War Over Words," U. S. News and World Report, vol. 101, October 6, 1986, p. 64.
- Maldoff, Eric. "Comment: a Canadian perspective," International Journal of the Sociology of Language, vol. 60, 1986, pp. 105-114.

- Mar, D. Chinese Immigrants and the Ethnic Labor Markets.
Doctoral Dissertation, Berkeley, California, University of
California, 1985.
- Marshall, David F. "The Question of an Official Language:
language rights and the English Language Amendment,"
International Journal of the Sociology of Language, vol. 60,
1986, pp. 7-75.
- Marshall, David F. "Rebuttal essay," International Journal
of the Sociology of Language, vol. 60, 1986, pp. 201-211.
- Mathews, Jay. "Bilingual Education Program in California
to Undergo Major Change," The Olympian, January 16, 1987,
p. 7.
- Mathews, Jay. "Immigrant Dominance Sparring a Backlash: town
turns against ethnic-American leaders," Washington Post,
May 10, 1986, sec. I, p. A 3.
- Mathews, Jay. "Initiative Seeks to Make English the Civil
Tongue: official language law likely in California,"
Washington Post, October 11, 1986, sec. I, p. A 4.
- May, Lee. "English-Only Foes Line Up Behind U. S. Education
Bill," Los Angeles Times, June 11, 1986, part I, p. 3.
- May, Lee. "Latinos Assail Bilingual Education Plans," Los
Angeles Times, January 25, 1986, part I, p. 3.
- May, Lee. "U. S. Faulted on Bilingual Education: GAO says
misuse of research led to criticism of programs," Los
Angeles Times, November 8, 1986, part I, p. 20.
- Mikeš, Melanie. "Comment," International Journal of the
Sociology of Language, vol. 60, 1986, pp. 153-156.
- Milán, William G. "Comment: undressing the English Language
Amendment," International Journal of the Sociology of
Language, vol. 60, 1986, pp. 93-96.
- Mitchell, Henry. "On Speaking the Language," Washington Post,
September 12, 1986, p. F 3.
- Molina, Mauricio. "Less Spanish Please," New York Times,
March 17, 1980, p. 34.
- The Movement to Make English the Official Language. Transcript
of a symposium held at the New York City Bar Association
December 2, 1986.

NABE News, October 1988, vol. 12, no. 2.

The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Forum,
November-December 1988, vol. 12, no. 1.

New Voices: immigrant students in U. S. public schools. Boston,
National Coalition of Advocates for Students, 1988.

"No Se Habla Español," Time, vol. 132, November 21, 1988, p. 86.

Nunberg, Geoffrey. "An 'Official Language' for California,"
New York Times, October 2, 1986, sec. A, p. 23.

Official English: questions and answers. Washington, D. C.,
U. S. English, 1988.

Pierce, Neil. "Here, Opportunity Speaks English: will
bilingualism condemn immigrants to the ultimate racism?"
New York Times, June 26, 1983, p. D 5.

"Quebec's Legislature Again Makes English an Official Language,"
Wall Street Journal, December 17, 1979, p. 9.

Rampe, David. "Power Panel in Making: the Hispanic caucus,"
New York Times, September 30, 1988, p. B 5.

Reese, Michael and Gerald C. Lubenow. "California Blahs,"
Newsweek, vol. 108, October 20, 1986, p. 35.

Reyes, David. "Boos Greet Prop. 63 Debator in Barrio: Santa
Ana audience critical of English language measure," Los
Angeles Times, October 15, 1986, part II, p. 4.

Rodriguez, Richard. "Bilingualism, Con: outdated and
unrealistic," New York Times, November 10, 1985, sec. 12,
p. 63.

Rodriguez, Richard. Hunger for Memory: the education of
Richard Rodriguez. Boston, David R. Godine, 1982.

Rodriguez, Richard. "Memories of a Bilingual Childhood,"
American Educator, vol. 5, Spring 1981, pp. 12-21.

Rodriguez, Richard. "Prop. 63 Would Betray State's Future,"
Los Angeles Times, October 26, 1986, part IV, pp. 1-2.

Rodriguez, Richard. "Unilingual, Not Unilateral," Wall
Street Journal, June 25, 1985, p. 1.

Russell, Cheryl. "Editor's Note: true or false?" American
Demographics, vol. 9, February 1987, p. 7.

- Salholz, Eloise and others. "Say it in English: advocates argue that America needs an official language, but critics believe it's a cover for racism," Newsweek, vol. 113, February 20, 1989, pp. 22-23.
- Sanoff, Alvin P. and Lucia Solorzano. "It's at Home Where Our Language is in Distress," U. S. News and World Report, vol. 98, February 18, 1985, pp. 54-57.
- Schmalz, Jeffrey. "Hispanic Influx Spurs 3 Ballots on Language," New York Times, October 26, 1988, pp. 1, B 8.
- Schmitt, Eric. "English-Only Bill Ignites Debate and Fear on Long Island," New York Times, February 14, 1989, p. B 3.
- Schreiner, Tim. "English Spoken Here," American Demographics, vol. 9, April 1987, p. 52.
- Shanker, Albert. "Reaganites Talk Tough but Don't Act: schools still pressed to go bilingual," New York Times, April 10, 1983, p. 9.
- Skewes, Elizabeth. "Push for Official State Language Goes to Court," The Tampa Tribune, January 8, 1988, pp. 1 A, 8 A.
- Stalker, James C. "Official English or English Only: English as official language of United States," English Journal, vol. 77, March 1988, pp. 18-23.
- Stencel, Sandra. "Bilingual Education: melting pot vs. cultural pluralism," Editorial Research Reports, Vol. 11, August 19, 1977, pp. 617-636.
- Stewart, Jill. "Challenged English-Only Rule: panel rejects court clerk plea," Los Angeles Times, January 31, 1985, part IX, p. 1.
- Stewart, Jill. "Huntington Park Judges 'Incredulous': English-only rule still creating uproar," Los Angeles Times, April 11, 1985, part IX, p. 1.
- Suhor, Charles. "English Only Movement Emerging as a Major Controversy," Educational Leadership, vol. 46, September 1988, pp. 80-81.
- "Suit Challenges Court English-Only Rule," Los Angeles Times, March 24, 1985, part I, p. 16.

- Sundberg, Trudy J. "The Case Against Bilingualism," [Includes text of National Council of Teachers of English resolution on English as US 'Official Language']; English Journal, vol. 77, March 1988, pp. 16-17.
- Tanzer, Andrew. "Little Taipei," Forbes, vol. 135, May 8, 1985, p. 88.
- Thomas, Jo. "Miami Area Divided Over Ballot Proposal to Drop Spanish as Second Official Language," New York Times, November 2, 1980, p. A 26.
- "3 States Plan Vote on Language Issue," New York Times, October 26, 1988, p. A 16.
- Tiedemann, Arthur E. "Why Must English-as-a-Second-Language Be 'Remedial'?" New York Times, March 25, 1981, p. 26.
- Trasvina, John D. "An Unethical Proposition," Political Review, October 7, 1986, pp. 4, 8.
- Trasvina, John D. "Official Language Means Discrimination," USA Today, July 25, 1986.
- Trombley, William. "Assemblyman Vows to Carry the Ball for English-Only Action," Los Angeles Times, November 6, 1986, part I, pp. 3, 31.
- Trombley, William. "California Elections: English-only proposition kindles minorities' fears," Los Angeles Times, October 12, 1986, part I, pp. 1, 29, 30.
- Trombley, William. "California Elections: many supporters also favor bilingual education, ballots; Latino backing of English-only a puzzle," Los Angeles Times, October 25, 1986, part II, p. 5.
- Trombley, William. "English-Only Proposition Kindles Minorities' Fears," Los Angeles Times, October 12, 1986, p. 1.
- Trombley, William. "Norman Cousins Drops His Support of Prop. 63," Los Angeles Times, October 16, 1986, part I, pp. 3, 22.
- Trombley, William. "Prop. 63 Backer Will Try to Defeat Opposing Candidates," Los Angeles Times, October 1, 1986, part I, p. 3.
- Trombley, William. "Prop 63 Finance Infraction Alleged," Los Angeles Times, September 19, 1986, p. I 25.

- Trombley, William. "Prop. 63 Roots Traced to Small Michigan City: measure to make English Official language of state sprang from concern over immigration, population," Los Angeles Times, October 20, 1986, part I, p. 3.
- Trombley, William. "Prop. 63--The Latest Battle in War of Words Over Language," Los Angeles Times, October 21, 1986, part I, p. 3.
- "U. S. Court Allows Vote on Official English," New York Times, October 13, 1988, p. A 18.
- U. S. English News. Facts on Official English. Washington, D. C., U. S. English, 1987.
- U. S. English Update. May-June 1988, vol. 6, no. 3.
- U. S. English Update. July-August 1988, vol. 6, no. 4.
- U. S. English Update. September-October 1988, vol. 6, no. 5.
- U. S. English Update. November-December 1988, vol. 6, no. 6.
- "U. S. Trying to Block Florida Vote on English," New York Times, November 3, 1988, p. A 24.
- Valdes, Joyce Merrill. Culture Bound: bridging the cultural gap in language teaching. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Veltman, Calvin. "Comment," International Journal of the Sociology of Language, vol. 60, 1986, pp. 177-181.
- Veltman, Calvin. Language Shift in the United States. New York, Mouton, 1983.
- Vidal, David. "Study Shows Hispanic Residents in Favor of Bilingual Way of Life," New York Times, May 13, 1980, p. A 1, B 8.
- Ward, Mike. "Language Rift in All American City," Los Angeles Times, November 13, 1985, sec. C3 part II.
- Ward, Mike and Victor Valle. "Attempts to Make English Official Language Set Back," Los Angeles Times, November 27, 1985, part II, p. 5.
- "We Don't Need Laws to Protect English," USA Today, July 25, 1986.
- "We Don't Need Laws to Put English First," Editorial. USA Today, February 13, 1987, p. 12 A.

Wells, Stacy. "Bilingualism: the accent is on youth," U. S. News & World Report, vol. 101, July 28, 1986, p. 60.

Why English First? Springfield, Virginia, English First, 1988.

Wildermuth, John. "English-Only Proposition Draws Lots of Hot Words," San Francisco Chronicle, October 20, 1986, p. A 7.

Will, George F. "In Defense of the Mother Tongue," Newsweek, vol. 106, July 8, 1985, p. 78.

"Wilson Backs Initiative for English-Only Law in State," Los Angeles Times, August 21, 1986, part I, pp. 3, 23.

Wingate, P. J. "U. S. English? Geez, Yawl Mustn't be Like Serious, Podner," Wall Street Journal, June 24, 1986, p. 34.

Woolard, Kathryn A. "Comment," International Journal of the Sociology of Language, vol. 60, 1986, pp. 191-195.

"Words of War: proliferation of Spanish in U. S. inspires action against bilingualism: some even want to amend the Constitution to give English protected status," Wall Street Journal, July 22, 1985, p. 1.

Wright, Guy. "U. S. English," San Francisco Sunday Examiner and Chronicle, March 20, 1983, sec. B 9.